

Langel that two BlackLight applications formally handled by him were allowable before he was told to misrepresent that fact and, thus, was forced to resign from examining those cases "for moral and ethical reasons."

As further revealed by Examiner Langel, and confirmed by two other Examiners, "allowance is not an option" in any pending BlackLight application according to official PTO policy. Under that arbitrary and capricious policy, the anonymous group of individuals, i.e. "Secret Committee," responsible for directing the named Examiner's actions in this case has knowingly violated well-established patent laws and procedures in presuming the utility of Applicant's novel hydrogen technology to be *per se* incredible as an excuse for its failure to properly consider and evaluate the scientific evidence of record amassed by Applicant at great expense. [See, e.g., MPEP § 2107, pp. 2100-31 ("A conclusion that an asserted utility is incredible can be reached only after the Office has evaluated both the assertion of the applicant regarding utility and any evidentiary basis of that assertion. The [Examiner] should be particularly careful not to start with a presumption that an asserted utility is, *per se*, "incredible" and then proceed to base a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 on that presumption."))]

Following Examiner Langel's resignation from examining BlackLight's cases, Applicant was informed that all of those cases would be consolidated under the authority of a new examiner, which was about the time Dr. Bernard Eng-Kie Souw first began making an appearance as the Committee's most prominent and outspoken member. Indeed, Examiner Souw has drafted numerous lengthy appendices totaling hundreds of pages and his views of Applicant's novel hydrogen technology have found their way into virtually every rejection and argument of record in all of Applicant's pending cases. Those views, however, not only lack credibility on the merits, but also, more disturbingly, reflect an extreme bias due to a genuine conflict of interest involving Dr. Souw's ownership of, and work as the lead scientist for, a competing company (BMS Enterprise) while examining Applicant's cases. Consequently, the Committee's rejections in all of BlackLight's cases, including this one, which have adopted Dr. Souw's biased and erroneous views, are fatally defective and should be immediately withdrawn to allow these cases to issue.

In furtherance of its "allowance is not an option" policy, the Committee has also manufactured new, and often conflicting, patentability standards that have been used to improperly discount or wholly ignore Applicant's scientific data evidencing the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. For instance, the Committee has improperly imposed standards without legal basis requiring that Applicant publish his scientific evidence in peer-reviewed journal articles to establish its credibility and that Applicant's theory of operation for his novel hydrogen technology find "support [or acceptance] in the scientific community." Applicant has complied with these contrived standards by submitting over 65 technical articles evidencing the lower-energy states of hydrogen, which have been peer-reviewed by highly qualified PhD's scientists and published in esteemed scientific journals. Yet even that evidence, which the Committee has admitted is entitled to "the credibility that peer-reviewed articles have," is rejected as *per se* incredible because it supposedly "detract[s] from the central issue that the hydrino does not theoretically exist" and that "all of applicant's data cannot prove what is not theoretically possible."

Unable to cite legitimate scientific evidence to counter the extensive credible evidence published in Applicant's peer-reviewed journal articles, the Committee has adopted the fraudulent analysis published in an article by Dr. Andreas Rathke and other fictitious "evidence" in a transparent effort to elevate outdated and flawed quantum theory to the status of "physical law," to make it seem as though the existence of lower-energy hydrogen predicted by Applicant is "incredible." [See *infra*.] Even the Committee's conflicted lead Examiner, BMS President Souw, has admitted, however, that quantum theory "needs improvement" and that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is not impossible. [See *infra*; and see, e.g., the Committee's September 29, 2005 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877; Souw Appendix at p. 3 attached August 24, 2004 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,051.] Yet, despite these and other embarrassing facts that have come to light, the Committee continues to rely upon the fraud of Dr. Rathke and the biased views of BMS President Souw to avoid fairly considering Applicant's experimental evidence that lower-energy hydrogen does in fact exist.

In view of these and other reasons to be explained, the rejection of claims 1-28 and 38-166 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 112, second paragraph, as lacking utility and enablement is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that the Committee has not met its burden of raising a *prima facie* case of inoperability for the many reasons of record and, therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn on that basis alone. Furthermore, Applicant has disclosed substantial experimental evidence in the present disclosure, prior submissions, and submissions filed herewith that fully rebut any *prima facie* case of inoperability the Committee might have raised. Applicant responds more fully to the Committee's comments, discusses the experimental evidence of record, and summarizes the improper prosecution procedures used by the Committee in the following paragraphs. For these additional reasons, the Section 101 rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant has filed Rule 132 Declarations certifying his submitted experimental evidence, which further rebuts the Committee's unjustified utility and enablement rejections of the claimed invention. This evidence, which the Committee required Applicant to make public by submitting it to scientific journals for publication, conclusively confirms the formation of lower-energy hydrogen through practice of Applicant's novel hydrogen chemistry. To this day, the Committee has failed to properly consider the numerous Rule 132 Declarations previously filed by Applicant in violation of its own rules, as outlined in MPEP § 716:

Evidence traversing rejections must be considered by the examiner whenever present. All entered affidavits, declarations, and other evidence traversing rejections are acknowledged and commented upon by the examiner in the next succeeding action. ... Where the evidence is insufficient to overcome the rejection, the examiner must specifically explain why the evidence is insufficient. General statements such "the declaration lacks technical validity" or "the evidence is not commensurate with the scope of the claims" without an explanation supporting such findings are insufficient. [Emphasis added.]

The Committee does not even mention, let alone consider, most of the certified experimental evidence identified in Applicant's Rule 132 Declarations that was submitted to overcome the rejections of record, which evidence is categorized and summarized below.

### Lower-Energy Hydrogen Experimental Data

With this latest submission, Applicant now has over 100 articles and books of record in this case, as reflected in the "List of References" set forth below. These articles detail studies that experimentally confirm a novel reaction of atomic hydrogen, which produces hydrogen in fractional quantum states that are at lower energies than the traditional "ground" ( $n = 1$ ) state, a chemically generated or assisted plasma (rt-plasma), and novel hydride compounds, including:

- extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy,<sup>1</sup>
- characteristic emission from catalysis and the hydride ion products,<sup>2</sup>
- lower-energy hydrogen emission,<sup>3</sup>
- plasma formation,<sup>4</sup>
- Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening,<sup>5</sup>
- population inversion of hydrogen lines,<sup>6</sup>
- elevated electron temperature,<sup>7</sup>
- anomalous plasma afterglow duration,<sup>8</sup>
- power generation,<sup>9</sup>
- excessive light emission,<sup>10</sup> and
- analysis of chemical compounds.<sup>11</sup>

In addition, Applicant has shown that direct plasma to electric power conversion is possible using this novel hydrogen chemistry.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ref. Nos. 11-16, 20, 24, 27-29, 31-36, 39, 42-43, 46-47, 50-52, 54-55, 57, 59, 63, 65-68, 70-76, 78-79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 89, 91-93, 95-96, 98, 101, 104, 108-109, 110-112. A complete list of Reference Nos. is given below.

<sup>2</sup> Ref. Nos. 24, 27, 32, 39, 42, 46, 51-52, 55, 57, 68, 72-73, 81, 89, 91, 108

<sup>3</sup> Ref. Nos. 14, 28-29, 33-36, 50, 63, 67, 70-71, 73, 75-76, 78-79, 86-87, 90, 92, 93, 98, 101, 104, 110-112

<sup>4</sup> Ref. Nos. 11-13, 15-16, 20, 24, 27, 32, 39, 42, 46-47, 51-52, 54-55, 57, 72, 81, 89, 91-93, 108-109

<sup>5</sup> Ref. Nos. 16, 20, 30, 33-37, 39, 42-43, 49, 51-52, 54-55, 57, 63-65, 68-69, 71-74, 81-85, 88-89, 91, 92, 93, 95-97, 105, 108-109, 114

<sup>6</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 46, 51, 54, 55, 57, 59, 65-66, 68, 74, 83, 85, 89, 91

<sup>7</sup> Ref. Nos. 34-37, 43, 49, 63, 67, 73

<sup>8</sup> Ref. Nos. 12-13, 47, 81

<sup>9</sup> Ref. Nos. 30-31, 33, 35-36, 39, 43, 50, 63, 71-73, 76-77, 81, 84, 89, 92, 93, 98, 101, 104, 108, 110-112

<sup>10</sup> Ref. Nos. 11, 16, 20, 23, 31, 37, 43, 52, 72, 109

<sup>11</sup> Ref. Nos. 6-10, 19, 25, 38, 41, 44-45, 60-62, 64, 69, 75, 81-82, 87-88, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98, 100, 101, 104, 108, 110-112

<sup>12</sup> Ref. Nos. 18, 26, 40, 48, 56, 68



A summary of Applicant's experimental data confirming the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is set forth below:

1.) the observation of intense extreme ultraviolet (EUV) emission at low temperatures (e.g.  $\approx 10^3 K$ ) from atomic hydrogen and only those atomized elements or gaseous ions which provide a net enthalpy of reaction of approximately  $m \cdot 27.2 eV$  via the ionization of  $t$  electrons to a continuum energy level where  $t$  and  $m$  are each an integer (e.g.  $K$  and  $Cs$  atoms and  $Rb^+$  and  $Sr^+$  ions ionize at integer multiples of the potential energy of atomic hydrogen and caused emission; whereas, the chemically similar atoms,  $Na$ ,  $Mg$ , and  $Ba$ , do not ionize at integer multiples of the potential energy of atomic hydrogen and caused no emission),<sup>13</sup>

2.) the observation of novel EUV emission lines from microwave and glow discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 eV$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12$  or these lines inelastically scattered by helium atoms in the excitation of  $He(1s^2)$  to  $He(1s^1 2p^1)$  that were identified as hydrogen transitions to electronic energy levels below the "ground" state corresponding to fractional quantum numbers,<sup>14</sup>

3.) the observation of novel EUV emission lines from microwave and glow discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen at  $44.2 nm$  and  $40.5 nm$  with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 + \left( \frac{1}{n_f^2} - \frac{1}{n_i^2} \right) \cdot 13.6 eV$  where  $q = 2$  and  $n_f = 2, 4$   $n_i = \infty$  that corresponded to multipole coupling to give two-photon emission from a continuum excited state atom and an atom undergoing fractional Rydberg state transition,<sup>15</sup>

4.) the identification of transitions of atomic hydrogen to lower energy levels corresponding to lower-energy hydrogen atoms in the extreme ultraviolet emission spectrum from interstellar medium and the sun,<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ref. Nos. 11-13, 15-16, 20, 24, 27, 32, 39, 42, 46-47, 51-52, 54-55, 57, 72, 81, 89, 91-93, 108-109

<sup>14</sup> Ref. Nos. 28, 33-36, 50, 63, 67, 71, 73, 75-76, 78, 86-87, 90

<sup>15</sup> Ref. Nos. 36, 71, 73

<sup>16</sup> Ref. Nos. 1, 5, 17, 28-29

5.) the observation that the novel EUV series of lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  was observed with an Evenson microwave cell, only the peak corresponding to  $q = 2$  was observed with an RF cell, and none of the peaks were observed with a glow discharge cell,<sup>17</sup>

6.) the observation that in a comparison of Evenson, McCarroll, cylindrical, and Beenakker microwave cavity plasmas, the novel EUV series of lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  was only observed for Evenson-cavity helium-hydrogen plasmas,<sup>18</sup>

7.) the EUV spectroscopic observation of lines for a hydrogen- $K$  catalyst plasma by the Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. that could be assigned to transitions of atomic hydrogen to lower energy levels corresponding to fractional principal quantum numbers and the emission from the excitation of the corresponding hydride ions,<sup>19</sup>

8.) the recent analysis of mobility and spectroscopy data of individual electrons in liquid helium which shows direct experimental confirmation that electrons may have fractional principal quantum energy levels,<sup>20</sup>

9.) the observation of novel EUV emission lines from microwave discharges of argon or helium with 10% hydrogen that matched those predicted for the reaction  $H(1/4) + H^+ \rightarrow H_2(1/4)^+$  having an energy spacing of  $2^2$  times the transition-state vibrational energy of  $H_2^+$  with the series ending on the bond energy of  $H_2(1/4)^+$ ,<sup>21</sup>

10.) the result that the novel vibrational series for the reaction  $H(1/4) + H^+ \rightarrow H_2(1/4)^+$  was only observed for catalyst plasmas of helium, neon, and argon mixed with hydrogen, but not with noncatalyst xenon or krypton mixed plasmas,<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ref. Nos. 71, 73

<sup>18</sup> Ref. No. 76

<sup>19</sup> Ref. No. 14

<sup>20</sup> Ref. Nos. 17, 53

<sup>21</sup> Ref. Nos. 29, 70, 73, 79, 92, 93, 98, 101, 104

<sup>22</sup> Ref. Nos. 29, 70, 73, 79, 92, 93, 101

11.) the observation that based on the intensities of the peaks, the catalyst and the plasma source dependence of the reaction rate to form  $H_2(1/4)^+$  is  $Ar^+ > He^+ > Ne^+$  and microwave > glow discharge >> RF, respectively,<sup>23</sup>

12.) the observation that the microwave plasma source dependence of the reaction rate to form  $H_2(1/4)^+$  is Evenson microwave > McCarroll, cylindrical, Beenakker,<sup>24</sup>

13.) the observation of a series of vibration-rotational bands in the 60-67 nm region, a high-energy region for which vibration-rotational spectra are ordinarily unknown, emitted from low-pressure helium-hydrogen (99/1%) microwave plasmas that matched the predicted energy spacing of the vibrational energy of  $H_2$  about the bond energy of  $H_2(1/2)$  corresponding to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$ ,<sup>25</sup>

14.) the observation of EUV plasma emission spectra in the region 60 nm to 100 nm that matched the predicted emission lines  $E_{D_{H_2}}$  due to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$  with vibronic coupling at energies of  $E_{D+vib} = 17.913 \pm \left(\frac{\nu^*}{3}\right) 0.515902 \text{ eV}$  to longer wavelengths for  $\nu^* = 2$  to  $\nu^* = 32$  and to shorter wavelengths for  $\nu^* = 1$  to  $\nu^* = 16$  to within the spectrometer resolution of about  $\pm 0.05\%$ ,<sup>26</sup>

15.) the observation that in addition to members of the series of novel emission lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  or  $E_{D+vib} = 17.913 \pm \left(\frac{\nu^*}{3}\right) 0.515902 \text{ eV}$  an additional intense peak was observed from a scaled-up Evenson cell at 41.6 nm with an energy of 29.81 eV that matched  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  with  $q = 4$  less 24.58741 eV corresponding to inelastic scattering of these photons by helium atoms due to ionization of He to  $He^+$ ,<sup>27</sup>

16.) the observation that in a comparison of Evenson, McCarroll, cylindrical, and Beenakker microwave cavity plasmas, the novel series of spectral lines due to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$  with vibronic coupling at energies of

<sup>23</sup> Ref. No. 70

<sup>24</sup> Ref. No. 79

<sup>25</sup> Ref. No. 99

<sup>26</sup> Ref. Nos. 50, 75-76, 78, 86-87, 90

<sup>27</sup> Ref. No. 86

$E_{D+vib} = 17.913 \pm \left(\frac{\nu^*}{3}\right) 0.515902 \text{ eV}$  was only observed for Evenson-cavity helium-hydrogen and neon-hydrogen plasmas,<sup>28</sup>

17.) the observation by gas chromatography that hydrogen was consumed by the helium-hydrogen plasmas which showed the novel EUV series of lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$ , the novel series of spectral lines due to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$  with vibronic coupling at energies of  $E_{D+vib} = 17.913 \pm \left(\frac{\nu^*}{3}\right) 0.515902 \text{ eV}$ , extraordinary H Balmer line broadening corresponding to 180-210 eV, and excess power of 21.9 W in 3 cm<sup>3</sup>,<sup>29</sup>

18.) the observation of the dominant  $He^+$  emission and an intensification of the plasma emission observed when  $He^+$  was present with atomic hydrogen demonstrated the role of  $He^+$  as a catalyst,<sup>30</sup>

19.) the observation of continuum state emission of  $Cs^{2+}$  and  $Ar^{2+}$  at 53.3 nm and 45.6 nm, respectively, with the absence of the other corresponding Rydberg series of lines from these species which confirmed the resonant nonradiative energy transfer of 27.2 eV from atomic hydrogen to the either  $Cs$  or  $Ar^+$  catalyst,<sup>31</sup>

20.) the spectroscopic observation of the predicted hydride ion  $H^-(1/2)$  of hydrogen catalysis by either  $Cs$  or  $Ar^+$  catalyst at 407 nm corresponding to its predicted binding energy of 3.05 eV,<sup>32</sup>

21.) the observation of characteristic emission from  $K^{3+}$  which confirmed the resonant nonradiative energy transfer of 3·27.2 eV from atomic hydrogen to atomic  $K$ ,<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Ref. No. 76

<sup>29</sup> Ref. No. 76

<sup>30</sup> Ref. Nos. 36, 73

<sup>31</sup> Ref. Nos. 24, 39, 51, 54-55, 57, 91

<sup>32</sup> Ref. No. 24

<sup>33</sup> Ref. Nos. 27, 39, 42, 46, 51, 54-55, 57, 81, 89, 91

22.) the spectroscopic observation of the predicted  $H^-(1/4)$  ion of hydrogen catalysis by  $K$  catalyst at 110 nm corresponding to its predicted binding energy of 11.2 eV,<sup>34</sup>

23.) the observation of characteristic emission from  $Rb^{2+}$  which confirmed the resonant nonradiative energy transfer of 27.2 eV from atomic hydrogen to  $Rb^+$ ,<sup>35</sup>

24.) the spectroscopic observation of the predicted  $H^-(1/2)$  ion of hydrogen catalysis by  $Rb^+$  catalyst at 407 nm corresponding to its predicted binding energy of 3.05 eV,<sup>36</sup>

25.) the observation of  $H^-(1/2)$ , the hydride ion catalyst product of  $K^+ / K^+$  or  $Rb^+$ , at its predicted binding energy of 3.0468 eV by high resolution visible spectroscopy as a continuum threshold at 4068.2 Å and a series of structured peaks separated from the binding energy by an integer multiple of the fine structure of  $H(1/2)$  starting at 4071 Å that matched predicted free-free transitions,<sup>37</sup>

26.) the observation that the high resolution visible  $K^+ / K^+$  or  $Rb^+ - H_2$  plasma emission spectra in the region of 3995 to 4060 Å matched the predicted bound-free hyperfine structure lines  $E_{HF}$  of  $H^-(1/2)$  calculated from the electron  $g$  factor as  $E_{HF} = j^2 3.00213 \times 10^{-5} + 3.0563$  eV ( $j$  is an integer) for  $j = 1$  to  $j = 39$  (3.0563 eV to 3.1012 eV—the hydride binding energy peak plus one and five times the spin-pairing energy, respectively) to within a 1 part per  $10^4$ ,<sup>38</sup>

27.)  $Rb^+$  or  $2K^+$  catalysts formed a plasma having strong VUV emission with a stationary inverted Lyman population with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing, and emission from  $H^-(1/2)$  was observed at 4071 Å corresponding to its predicted binding energy of 3.0468 eV with the fine structure and its predicted bound-free hyperfine structure lines  $E_{HF} = j^2 3.00213 \times 10^{-5} + 3.0563$  eV ( $j$  is an integer) that matched for  $j = 1$  to  $j = 37$  to within a 1 part per  $10^4$ ,<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Ref. Nos. 81, 42, 27

<sup>35</sup> Ref. Nos. 32, 39, 42, 46, 51, 54-55, 57, 81, 89, 91

<sup>36</sup> Ref. No. 32

<sup>37</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 42, 46, 57, 81, 89, 91

<sup>38</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 42, 46, 57, 81, 89, 91

<sup>39</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 42, 46, 51, 54, 55, 57, 81, 89, 91

28.) the observation of stationary inverted H Balmer and Lyman populations from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing at wavelengths over a wide range from micron to blue wherein molecular oxygen served as the catalyst as supported by  $O^{2+}$  emission and H Balmer line broadening of 55 eV compared to 1 eV for hydrogen alone,<sup>40</sup>

29.) the observation of H Balmer line broadening of 55 eV compared to 1 eV for hydrogen alone at distances up to 5 cm from the coupler,<sup>41</sup>

30.) the observation that with a microwave input power of  $9 \text{ W} \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$ , a collisional radiative model showed that the hydrogen excited state population distribution was consistent with an  $n = 1 \rightarrow 5, 6$  pumping power of an unprecedented  $200 \text{ W} \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$  permissive of gas laser efficiencies orders of magnitude those of conventional visible gas lasers and direct generation of electrical power using photovoltaic conversion of the spontaneous or stimulated water vapor plasma emission,<sup>42</sup>

31.) the observation of stimulation of the stationary inverted H Balmer population from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma by back illumination with an infrared source that showed depopulation of the  $n = 5$  state,<sup>43</sup>

32.) the observation of stationary inverted H Balmer and Lyman populations from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing was observed for Evenson microwave plasmas, but not for RF or discharge plasmas,<sup>44</sup>

33.) the observation of stationary inverted H Balmer and Lyman populations from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing that was dependent on the microwave plasma source with the highest inversion from Evenson microwave plasmas,<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Ref. Nos. 59, 65-66, 68, 74, 83, 85

<sup>41</sup> Ref. No. 74

<sup>42</sup> Ref. Nos. 68, 83, 85

<sup>43</sup> Ref. Nos. 59, 65, 68, 85

<sup>44</sup> Ref. Nos. 59, 65-66, 68, 73, 83, 85

<sup>45</sup> Ref. No. 83

34.) the observation of stationary inverted H Balmer and Lyman populations from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing that was dependent on the pressure of the Evenson microwave plasma,<sup>46</sup>

35.) the observation of stationary inverted H Balmer populations from a low pressure water-vapor microwave discharge plasma with an overpopulation sufficient for lasing at distances up to 5 cm from the coupler,<sup>47</sup>

36.) the observation that the requirement for the natural hydrogen-oxygen stoichiometry of the Evenson water plasma was stringent in that a deviation by over 2% excess of either gas caused a reversal of the H inversion in water vapor plasmas,<sup>48</sup>

37.) the observation of a typical slow H population for a water-vapor plasma maintained in a GEC-type cell that was independent of time, and a new phenomenon, an extraordinary fast population that increased from zero to a significant portion of the Balmer  $\alpha$  emission with time under no-flow conditions wherein the peak width and energy increased with time up to a 0.7 nm half-width corresponding to an average hydrogen atom energy of 200 eV,<sup>49</sup>

38.) the observation of a substantial fast H population (~20% at 40 eV) for a water-vapor plasmas maintained in a GEC-type cell that was independent of position including regions where the electric field was orders of magnitude too low to explain the extraordinarily high Doppler energies,<sup>50</sup>

39.) the observation of fast H population (40-50 eV) for  $He/H_2$  (95/5%),  $Ar/H_2$  (95/5%), and  $H_2$  plasmas maintained in a GEC-type cell that was independent of position including regions where the electric field was orders of magnitude too low to explain the extraordinarily high Doppler energies,<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Ref. Nos. 59, 68, 73, 83, 85

<sup>47</sup> Ref. No. 74

<sup>48</sup> Ref. Nos. 59, 68, 83, 85

<sup>49</sup> Ref. No. 95

<sup>50</sup> Ref. No. 96

<sup>51</sup> Ref. Nos. 92, 93, 97, 105

40.) the observation of the features of excessive H broadening that can not be explained by field-acceleration models such as an isotropic effect (broadening is independent of position in the cell or observation direction relative to the applied-field direction, selective H broadening, lack of a requirement for a divertor or reflector, time dependence, lack of an applied-field or pressure dependence over a broad range, and the observation that only particular hydrogen-mixed plasmas show the extraordinary broadening,<sup>52</sup>

41.) the observation by the Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. of an anomalous plasma and plasma afterglow duration formed with hydrogen-potassium mixtures,<sup>53</sup>

42.) the observation of anomalous afterglow durations of plasmas formed by catalysts providing a net enthalpy of reaction within thermal energies of  $m \cdot 27.28 \text{ eV}$ ,<sup>54</sup>

43.) the formation of a chemically generated hydrogen plasma with the observation of Lyman series in the EUV that represents an energy release about 10 times that of hydrogen combustion which is greater than that of any possible known chemical reaction,<sup>55</sup>

44.) the observation of line emission by the Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. with a 4° grazing incidence EUV spectrometer that was 100 times more energetic than the combustion of hydrogen,<sup>56</sup>

45.) the excessive increase in the Lyman emission upon the addition of helium or argon catalyst to a hydrogen plasma,<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ref. No. 114

<sup>53</sup> Ref. Nos. 13, 47, 81

<sup>54</sup> Ref. Nos. 12, 13, 47, 81

<sup>55</sup> Ref. Nos. 11-13, 15-16, 20, 24, 27, 32, 39, 42, 46-47, 51-52, 54-55, 57, 72, 81, 89, 91, 109

<sup>56</sup> Ref. No. 14

<sup>57</sup> Ref. Nos. 20, 31, 37, 43



46.) the observation of the characteristic emission from  $Sr^+$  and  $Sr^{3+}$  that confirmed the resonant nonradiative energy transfer of  $2 \cdot 27.2 \text{ eV}$  from atomic hydrogen to  $Sr^+$ ,<sup>58</sup>

47.) the observation of anomalous plasmas formed with  $Sr$  and  $Ar^+$  catalysts at 1% of the theoretical or prior known voltage requirement with a light output per unit power input up to 8600 times that of the control standard light source,<sup>59</sup>

48.) the observation that the optically measured output power of gas cells for power supplied to the glow discharge increased by over two orders of magnitude depending on the presence of less than 1% partial pressure of certain catalysts in hydrogen gas or argon-hydrogen gas mixtures, and an excess thermal balance of 42 W was measured for the 97% argon and 3% hydrogen mixture versus argon plasma alone,<sup>60</sup>

49.) the observation that glow discharge plasmas of the catalyst-hydrogen mixtures of strontium-hydrogen, helium-hydrogen, argon-hydrogen, strontium-helium-hydrogen, and strontium-argon-hydrogen showed significant Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening corresponding to an average hydrogen atom temperature of 25 - 45 eV; whereas, plasmas of the noncatalyst-hydrogen mixtures of pure hydrogen, krypton-hydrogen, xenon-hydrogen, and magnesium-hydrogen showed no excessive broadening corresponding to an average hydrogen atom temperature of  $\approx 3 \text{ eV}$ ,<sup>61</sup>

50.) the observation that microwave helium-hydrogen and argon-hydrogen plasmas having catalyst  $Ar^+$  or  $He^+$  showed extraordinary Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening due to hydrogen catalysis corresponding to an average hydrogen atom temperature of 110 - 130 eV and 180 - 210 eV, respectively; whereas, plasmas of pure hydrogen, neon-hydrogen, krypton-hydrogen, and xenon-hydrogen showed no excessive broadening corresponding to an average hydrogen atom temperature of  $\approx 3 \text{ eV}$ ,<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Ref. Nos. 16, 52

<sup>59</sup> Ref. Nos. 11, 16, 20, 23, 52, 72

<sup>60</sup> Ref. No. 22

<sup>61</sup> Ref. Nos. 16, 20, 30, 52, 72

<sup>62</sup> Ref. Nos. 33-37, 43, 49, 60, 63-64, 69, 71, 73-74, 82, 84, 88

51.) the observation that microwave helium-hydrogen and argon-hydrogen plasmas showed average electron temperatures that were high,  $30,500 \pm 5\% K$  and  $13,700 \pm 5\% K$ , respectively; whereas, the corresponding temperatures of helium and argon alone were only  $7400 \pm 5\% K$  and  $5700 \pm 5\% K$ , respectively,<sup>63</sup>

52.) the observation of significant Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening of 17, 9, 11, 14, and 24 eV from rt-plasmas of incandescently heated hydrogen with  $K^+ / K^+$ ,  $Rb^+$ , cesium, strontium, and strontium with  $Ar^+$  catalysts, respectively, wherein the results could not be explained by Stark or thermal broadening or electric field acceleration of charged species since the measured field of the incandescent heater was extremely weak, 1 V/cm, corresponding to a broadening of much less than 1 eV,<sup>64</sup>

53.) calorimetric measurement of excess power of 20 mW/cc on rt-plasmas formed by heating hydrogen with  $K^+ / K^+$  and  $Ar^+$  as catalysts,<sup>65</sup>

54.) the observation of an energy balance of  $\Delta H = -17,925 \text{ kcal / mole } KNO_3$ , about 300 times that expected for the most energetic known chemistry of  $KNO_3$ , and  $-3585 \text{ kcal / mole } H_2$ , over 60 times the hypothetical maximum enthalpy of  $-57.8 \text{ kcal / mole } H_2$  due to combustion of hydrogen with atmospheric oxygen, assuming the maximum possible  $H_2$  inventory when  $KNO_3$  and Raney nickel were used as a source of  $K$  catalyst and atomic hydrogen, respectively, to produce the corresponding exothermic reaction,<sup>66</sup>

55.) the observation of rt-plasmas formed with strontium and argon at 1% of the theoretical or prior known voltage requirement with a light output per unit power input up to 8600 times that of the control standard light source as well as an excess power of 20 mW/cm from rt-plasmas formed by  $Ar^+$  as the catalyst in an incandescent-filament cell,<sup>67</sup>

56.) the Calvet calorimetry measurement of an energy balance of over  $-151,000 \text{ kJ / mole } H_2$  with the addition of 3% hydrogen to a plasma of argon having the

---

<sup>63</sup> Ref. Nos. 34-37, 43, 49, 63, 67, 73

<sup>64</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 42, 46, 51-52, 54-55, 57, 72, 81, 89, 91, 108-109

<sup>65</sup> Ref. Nos. 39, 81, 89, 108

<sup>66</sup> Ref. No. 111

<sup>67</sup> Ref. Nos. 72, 109

catalyst  $Ar^+$  compared to the enthalpy of combustion of hydrogen of  $-241.8 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$ ; whereas, under identical conditions no change in the Calvet voltage was observed when hydrogen was added to a plasma of noncatalyst xenon,<sup>68</sup>

57.) the observation that the power output exceeded the power supplied to hydrogen glow discharge plasmas by 35-184 W depending on the presence of catalysts from helium or argon and less than 1% partial pressure of strontium metal in noble gas-hydrogen mixtures; whereas, the chemically similar noncatalyst krypton had no effect on the power balance,<sup>69</sup>

58.) the observation that with the addition of 3% flowing hydrogen to an argon microwave plasma with a constant input power of 40 W, the gas temperature increased from 400°C to over 750°C; whereas, the 400°C temperature of a xenon plasma run under identical conditions was essentially unchanged with the addition of hydrogen,<sup>70</sup>

59.) observations of power such as that where the addition of 10% hydrogen to a helium microwave plasma maintained with a constant microwave input power of 40 W, the thermal output power was measured to be at least 280 W corresponding to a reactor temperature rise from room temperature to 1200°C within 150 seconds, a power density of  $28 \text{ MW/m}^3$ , and an energy balance of at least  $-4 \times 10^5 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$  compared to the enthalpy of combustion of hydrogen of  $-241.8 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$ ,<sup>71</sup>

60.) the observation of  $306 \pm 5 \text{ W}$  of excess power generated in  $45 \text{ cm}^3$  by a compound-hollow-cathode-glow discharge of a neon-hydrogen (99.5/0.5%) mixture corresponding to a power density of  $6.8 \text{ MW/m}^3$  and an energy balance of at least  $-1 \times 10^6 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$  compared to the enthalpy of combustion of hydrogen of  $-241.8 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$ ,<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Ref. No. 31

<sup>69</sup> Ref. No. 30

<sup>70</sup> Ref. No. 43

<sup>71</sup> Ref. Nos. 34, 35

<sup>72</sup> Ref. Nos. 50, 78

61.) the observation that for an input of 37.7 W, the total plasma power of the neon-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry was 60.7 W corresponding to 23.0 W of excess power in  $3 \text{ cm}^3$ ,<sup>73</sup>

62.) the observation of intense  $\text{He}^+$  emission and a total plasma power of a helium-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry of 30.0 W for an input of 8.1 W, corresponding to 21.9 W of excess power in  $3 \text{ cm}^3$  wherein the excess power density and energy balance were high,  $7.3 \text{ W/cm}^3$  and  $-2.9 \times 10^4 \text{ kJ/mole H}_2$ , respectively,<sup>74</sup>

63.) in the comparison of helium-hydrogen plasmas sources, the observation that i.) with an input power of  $24.8 \pm 1 \text{ W}$ , the total plasma power of the Evenson microwave helium-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry was  $49.1 \pm 1 \text{ W}$  corresponding to  $24.3 \pm 1 \text{ W}$  of excess power in  $3 \text{ cm}^3$  corresponding to a high excess power density and energy balance of  $8.1 \text{ W/cm}^3$  and over  $-3 \times 10^4 \text{ kJ/mole H}_2$ , respectively, ii.) with an input of 500 W, a total power of 623 W was generated in a  $45 \text{ cm}^3$  compound-hollow-cathode-glow discharge, iii.) less than 10% excess power was observed from inductively coupled RF helium-hydrogen plasmas, and iv.) no measurable heat was observed from MKS/Astex microwave helium-hydrogen plasmas that corresponded to the absence of H Balmer line broadening,<sup>75</sup>

64.) the observation of energy balances of helium-hydrogen microwave plasmas of over 100 times the combustion of hydrogen and power densities greater than  $10 \text{ W/cm}^3$  measured by water bath calorimetry,<sup>76</sup>

65.) at the load matching condition of  $600 \Omega$ , the direct plasmadynamic conversion (PDC) of open circuit voltages of 11.5 V and ~200 mW of electrical power with a 0.125 in diameter by 3/4 in long plasmadynamic electrode and a 140 G applied field corresponding to an extracted power density of  $\sim 1.61 \text{ W/cm}^3$  and an efficiency of  $\sim 18.8\%$ ,<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Ref. No. 76

<sup>74</sup> Ref. Nos. 36, 63, 71, 73

<sup>75</sup> Ref. Nos. 84, 98, 104

<sup>76</sup> Ref. Nos. 34-36, 50, 63, 71, 73, 76-78, 84, 92, 93, 101, 112

<sup>77</sup> Ref. No. 48

66.) at the load matching condition of  $250\ \Omega$ , the direct plasmadynamic conversion (PDC) of open circuit voltages of 21.8 V and 1.87 W of electrical power with a 0.125 in diameter by 3/4 in long plasmadynamic electrode and a 140 G applied field corresponding to an extracted power density of  $3.6\ \text{W}/\text{cm}^3$  and an efficiency of 42%,<sup>78</sup>

67.) the projection that the generation of electricity using magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) conversion of the plasma particle energy of small to mid-size chemically assisted microwave or glow discharge plasma (ca-plasma) power sources in the range of a few hundred Watts to several 10's of kW for microdistributed commercial applications appears feasible at 50% efficiency or better with a simple compact design,<sup>79</sup>

68.) the differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) measurement of minimum heats of formation of *KHI* by the catalytic reaction of *K* with atomic hydrogen and *KI* that were over  $-2000\ \text{kJ}/\text{mole}\ H_2$  compared to the enthalpy of combustion of hydrogen of  $-241.8\ \text{kJ}/\text{mole}\ H_2$ ,<sup>80</sup>

69.) the isolation of novel hydrogen compounds as products of the reaction of atomic hydrogen with atoms and ions which formed an anomalous plasma as reported in the EUV studies,<sup>81</sup>

70.) the synthesis and identification of a novel diamond-like carbon film terminated with  $CH(1/p)$  ( $H^+ DLC$ ) comprising high binding energy hydride ions was synthesized for the first time from solid carbon by a microwave plasma reaction of a mixture of 10-30% hydrogen and 90-70% helium wherein  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form the highly stable hydride ions and an energetic plasma,<sup>82</sup>

71.) the synthesis of polycrystalline diamond films on silicon substrates without diamond seeding by a very low power microwave plasma reaction of a mixture of helium-hydrogen-methane (48.2/48.2/3.6%) wherein  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma with an average hydrogen atom temperature of 180-210 eV versus  $\approx 3\ \text{eV}$  for pure hydrogen and bombardment of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Ref. No. 56

<sup>79</sup> Ref. No. 40

<sup>80</sup> Ref. No. 25

<sup>81</sup> Ref. Nos. 6-10, 19, 25, 38, 41, 44-45, 60-62, 75, 81, 87, 90, 92, 93, 100, 101, 108, 110-112

<sup>82</sup> Ref. No. 60

carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of diamond,<sup>83</sup>

72.) the synthesis of polycrystalline diamond films on silicon substrates without diamond seeding by a very low power microwave plasma reaction of a mixture of argon-hydrogen-methane (17.5/80/2.5%) wherein  $Ar^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma with an average hydrogen atom temperature of 110 - 130 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen and bombardment of the carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of diamond,<sup>84</sup>

73.) the identification of a novel highly stable surface coating  $SiH(1/p)$  by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy that showed  $SiH^+$  in the positive spectrum and  $H^-$  dominant in the negative spectrum and by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy which showed that the  $H$  content of the  $SiH$  coatings was hydride ions,  $H^-(1/4)$ ,  $H^-(1/9)$ , and  $H^-(1/11)$  corresponding to peaks at 11, 43, and 55 eV, respectively, and showed that the surface was remarkably stable to air,<sup>85</sup>

74.) the isolation of novel inorganic hydride compounds such as  $KHKHCO_3$  and  $KH$  following each of the electrolysis and plasma electrolysis of a  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte which comprised high binding energy hydride ions that were stable in water with their identification by methods such as (i) ToF-SIMS on  $KHKHCO_3$  which showed inorganic hydride clusters  $K[KHKHCO_3]^+$  and a negative ToF-SIMS dominated by hydride ion, (ii) X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy which showed novel peaks corresponding to high binding energy hydride ions, and (iii)  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy which showed upfield shifted peaks corresponding to more diamagnetic, high-binding-energy hydride ions,<sup>86</sup>

75.) the identification of  $LiHCl$  comprising a high binding energy hydride ion by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy which showed a dominant  $H^-$  in the negative ion spectrum, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy which showed  $H^-(1/4)$  as a new peak at its predicted binding energy of 11 eV,  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance

---

<sup>83</sup> Ref. Nos. 64, 69, 88

<sup>84</sup> Ref. Nos. 82, 88

<sup>85</sup> Ref. Nos. 45, 61, 100

<sup>86</sup> Ref. Nos. 6-7, 9, 38, 41

spectroscopy which showed an extraordinary upfield shifted peak of -15.4 ppm corresponding to the novel hydride ion, and powder X-ray diffraction which showed novel peaks,<sup>87</sup>

76.) the identification of novel hydride compounds by a number of analytical methods such as (i) time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy which showed a dominant hydride ion in the negative ion spectrum, (ii) X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy which showed novel hydride peaks and significant shifts of the core levels of the primary elements bound to the novel hydride ions, (iii)  $^1\text{H}$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (NMR) which showed extraordinary upfield chemical shifts compared to the NMR of the corresponding ordinary hydrides, and (iv) thermal decomposition with analysis by gas chromatography, and mass spectroscopy which identified the compounds as hydrides,<sup>88</sup>

77.) the NMR identification of novel hydride compounds  $MH^*X$  wherein  $M$  is the alkali or alkaline earth metal,  $X$ , is a halide, and  $H^*$  comprises a novel high binding energy hydride ion identified by a large distinct upfield resonance,<sup>89</sup>

78.) the replication of the NMR results of the identification of novel hydride compounds by large distinct upfield resonances at Spectral Data Services, University of Massachusetts Amherst, University of Delaware, Grace Davison, and National Research Council of Canada,<sup>90</sup>

79.) the NMR identification of novel hydride compounds  $MH^*$  and  $MH_2^*$  wherein  $M$  is the alkali or alkaline earth metal and  $H^*$  comprises a novel high binding energy hydride ion identified by a large distinct upfield resonance that proves the hydride ion is different from the hydride ion of the corresponding known compound of the same composition,<sup>91</sup>

80.) the observation that the  $^1\text{H}$  MAS NMR spectrum of novel compound  $KH^*Cl$  relative to external tetramethylsilane (TMS) showed a large distinct upfield resonance at

---

<sup>87</sup> Ref. Nos. 44, 62

<sup>88</sup> Ref. Nos. 6-10, 19, 25, 38, 41, 44-45, 60-62, 75, 81, 87, 90, 92, 93, 100, 108, 110-112

<sup>89</sup> Ref. Nos. 10, 19, 41, 44, 62, 81, 108, 110-112

<sup>90</sup> Ref. Nos. 19, 81, 108, 110

<sup>91</sup> Ref. Nos. 19, 81, 108, 110-112

-4.4 corresponding to an absolute resonance shift of -35.9 ppm that matched the theoretical prediction of  $p = 4$ , and the novel peak of  $KH^*I$  at -1.5 ppm relative to TMS corresponding to an absolute resonance shift of -33.0 ppm matched the theoretical prediction of  $p = 2$ ,<sup>92</sup>

81.) the observation that the predicted catalyst reactions, position of the upfield-shifted NMR peaks, and spectroscopic data for  $H^-(1/2)$  and  $H^-(1/4)$  were found to be in agreement,<sup>93</sup>

82.) the analysis by Infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy which eliminated any known explanation such as U centered H for the assignment of the extraordinary upfield-shifted NMR peak.<sup>94</sup>

83.) the isolation of fraction-principal-quantum-level molecular hydrogen  $H_2(1/p)$  gas by liquefaction using an ultrahigh-vacuum, liquid nitrogen cryotrap, and the observations of novel peaks by cryogenic gas chromatography, a higher ionization energy than  $H_2$  by mass spectroscopy, a substantial change in the EUV emission spectrum with deuterium substitution in a region where no hydrogen emission has ever been observed, and upfield shifted NMR peaks at 0.21, 2.18 and 3.47 ppm compared to that of  $H_2$  at 4.63 ppm,<sup>95</sup>

84.) the observation of  $^1H$  NMR singlet peaks upfield of  $H_2$  with a predicted integer spacing of 0.64 ppm at 3.47, 3.02, 2.18, 1.25, 0.85, and 0.22 ppm identified as the consecutive series  $H_2(1/2)$ ,  $H_2(1/3)$ ,  $H_2(1/4)$ ,  $H_2(1/5)$ ,  $H_2(1/6)$ , and  $H_2(1/7)$ , respectively, and  $H_2(1/10)$  at -1.8 ppm wherein  $H_2(1/p)$  gas was isolated by liquefaction at liquid nitrogen temperature, by decomposition of compounds found to contain the corresponding hydride ions  $H^-(1/p)$ , and by permeation through a hollow nickel cathode,<sup>96</sup>

85.) the observation of excess enthalpy from a  $K_2CO_3$  electrolytic cell of a factor of two times that of the resistive power dissipation and  $^1H$  NMR singlet peaks upfield of

---

<sup>92</sup> Ref. Nos. 81, 108, 110-112

<sup>93</sup> Ref. Nos. 81, 108, 110-112

<sup>94</sup> Ref. Nos. 108, 110-112

<sup>95</sup> Ref. Nos. 75, 87, 90, 92, 93, 94, 101, 112

<sup>96</sup> Ref. Nos. 98, 101, 103-104, 112



$H_2$  with a predicted integer spacing of 0.64 ppm at 3.49, 2.17, 1.25, 0.86, and 0.21 ppm which matched the consecutive series  $H_2(1/2)$ ,  $H_2(1/4)$ ,  $H_2(1/5)$ ,  $H_2(1/6)$ , and  $H_2(1/7)$ , respectively, and a higher ionizing molecular hydrogen recorded on the electrolysis gases collected in a hollow nickel cathode,<sup>97</sup>

86.) the observation of 1943  $cm^{-1}$  and 2012  $cm^{-1}$  peaks in the high-resolution (0.5  $cm^{-1}$ ) FTIR spectrum (490-4000  $cm^{-1}$ ) of  $KH^*I$  having a peak assigned to  $H^-(1/4)$  that matched the predicted frequencies of ortho and para- $H_2(1/4)$ ,<sup>98</sup>

87.) the observation of the 1943/2012  $cm^{-1}$ -peak-intensity ratio of 3:1 in the high resolution (0.5  $cm^{-1}$ ) FTIR spectrum (1875-2060  $cm^{-1}$ ) of  $KH^*I$  which is characteristic of ortho-para hydrogen splitting wherein the ortho-para splitting of 69  $cm^{-1}$  matched that predicted,<sup>99</sup>

88.) the observation of rotational lines in the 145-300 nm region from atmospheric pressure 12.5 keV electron-beam excited argon-hydrogen plasmas where the unprecedented energy spacing of  $4^2$  times that of hydrogen established the internuclear distance as 1/4 that of  $H_2$  and identified  $H_2(1/4)$ ,<sup>100</sup>

89.) the observation of emission from 12.5 keV-electron-beam-excited  $KH^*Cl$  having  $H^-(1/4)$  by NMR that matched the rotational emission lines of interstitial  $H_2(1/4)$  and further matched the rotational frequency of  $H_2(1/4)$  observed by FTIR and by electron-beam excitation of the argon-hydrogen plasmas.<sup>101</sup>

The dismissal of this extensive body of experimental evidence by the Secret Committee, led by Dr. Souw, is a major disappoint, not only for its failure to fairly evaluate this evidence of lower energy states, but also for its incredible lack of understanding of the nature of Applicant's invention as it relates to the most basic scientific principles. Applicant had expected that Dr. Souw, as the founder and current president of BMS Enterprise—a company that competes in some of the same scientific

---

<sup>97</sup> Ref. Nos. 103-104

<sup>98</sup> Ref. Nos. 110-112

<sup>99</sup> Ref. Nos. 110-112

<sup>100</sup> Ref. Nos. 98, 101, 104, 110-112

<sup>101</sup> Ref. Nos. 111-112

fields as Applicant—would have a better grasp of the concepts underlying the technology he is examining. Or it could just be that Dr. Souw is unable to put his conflicting business interests aside and fairly evaluate a competitor's invention, along with the supporting evidence submitted therewith.

In either case, the erroneous arguments that populate Dr. Souw's various Office Actions and Appendices, particularly those in defense of outdated quantum theory, are untenable. Particularly disturbing is the fact that the Committee in this case has elevated Dr. Souw's distorted views of that seriously flawed theory, one that he readily admits "needs improvement," into the category of an accepted "scientific principle" upon which Applicant's invention and supporting experimental evidence is falsely proclaimed to be "incredible." This fundamental error permeates the Committee's entire analysis, which has resulted in the misguided rejections of Applicant's claims for allegedly failing to comply with the utility and enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, respectively.

With now over 65 peer-reviewed articles in esteemed scientific journals evidencing the existence of lower energy states, along with other countless evidence, Applicant's modern quantum theory has now gained acceptance in the scientific community in accordance with one of the many new standards created by the Committee for this one Applicant. [See *infra*.] The Committee's refusal to grant Applicant a fair and expeditious hearing on that evidence, led by BMS President Souw, is a "black eye" to an agency charged with the public trust to impartially carry out its constitutional directive of promoting the progress of science.

Applicant again respectfully demands that the Committee consider and evaluate in detail all of the record evidence, which, to date, it has largely ignored. The scientific data disclosed in this extensive body of evidence was collected and peer-reviewed with great care by a group of highly qualified scientists capable of understanding every detail of Applicant's technology. The very least the Committee can do is to also carefully evaluate that data in detail, article by article, with an open mind so that Applicant is given a full and fair opportunity to present his case. If and when the Committee finally does so, Applicant believes it will find that the evidence overwhelmingly proves the existence of lower-energy hydrogen in accordance with his disclosed invention.

If, on the other hand, the Committee should find true fault with any of that data on legitimate scientific grounds—not the kind of nitpicking Applicant has seen on theoretical grounds—it should communicate as much to afford Applicant the opportunity to respond. Such scientific give-and-take is the only way to advance the prosecution of this case.

Unfortunately, with continued prosecution of this and BlackLight's other applications, a far different pattern has emerged. The Committee continues to set arbitrary and capricious hurdles designed to avoid considering Applicant's conclusive experimental evidence and thereby block his patents from issuing. Each time Applicant clears one of these hurdles, the Committee merely raises the bar by setting new standards.

For instance, the Committee initially alleged that Applicant's disclosed hydrogen chemistry, which forms lower-energy hydrogen, related to the controversial concepts of "perpetual motion" and "cold fusion." When Applicant exposed those allegations as utter nonsense, the Committee quickly abandoned its indefensible position, arguing instead that BlackLight's lower-energy hydrogen technology violated unidentified laws of physics. Then, to cover up its failure to identify even a single physical law that was supposedly being violated, the Committee improperly placed the burden on Applicant to do so: "in order to establish enablement, applicant bears the burden of providing the accepted scientific laws wrong or incomplete." [See page 6 of Office Action dated July 16, 2001 in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,911.] When Applicant showed that just the opposite is true—that Applicant's novel hydrogen chemistry complies with all physical laws, even at atomic and sub-atomic levels—the Committee once again backpedaled.<sup>102</sup>

The Committee then advanced vague assertions that the concept of lower-energy hydrogen violated "ideas" of modern science and that this technology contradicted "beliefs" in the scientific community. These assertions later evolved into a

---

<sup>102</sup> The Committee later resurrected this abandoned argument in a last-ditch effort to brand Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology a scientific impossibility, relying on an internet posting to claim that the ground state of an electron is a basic physical law that cannot be violated. As Applicant shows herein below, that argument is also wholly without merit and, in fact, contradicts even the biased views of Examiner/BMS President Souw, who was assigned to oversee examination of all of Applicant's cases based on his alleged technical expertise. [See *infra*.]

new standard requiring Applicant to show that his theory of operation has "support [or acceptance] in the scientific community." See, for example, the August 25, 2005 Office Action issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/181,180:

The claims are directed to [a] device for generating heat based upon hydrogen catalysis. In this device a source of hydrogen and a vapor catalysis are sent to a reaction chamber wherein heat is generated because, by applicant's theory, the energy level of atomic hydrogen is reduced from the stable level of  $N=1$  to lower levels such as  $N=\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$  etc to form atoms known as "hydrinos". In this reduction, large amounts of energy are said to be produced. The examiner considers that this description would not enable the skilled artisan to make and use the invention. In the first place, there is no support in the scientific community for applicant's theory of operation.

\* \* \*

Applicant's arguments filed May 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has submitted many non-patent literature documents in the IDS filed 5/25/05, but it is not clear which if any of these documents indicate that the theory upon [which] applicant's invention is based has been accepted in the scientific community. [Office Action at 2-3 (emphasis added).]

This standard, like so many others promoted by the Committee in this case, is erroneous and should be withdrawn for two reasons: first, the level of support (or acceptance) in the scientific community is not the proper standard for ascertaining whether an applicant has satisfied the enablement or utility requirements under Sections 112 and 101, respectively; and second, even under that erroneous standard, Applicant has clearly met it by showing that his claimed invention does have support in the scientific community.

Regarding the Committee's misplaced reliance on its newly minted "support in the scientific community" standard to deny Applicant patent protection for his pioneering technology, that standard makes absolutely no sense and thus, not surprisingly, has no legal basis. Until recent rule changes, the PTO kept patent applications in strict confidence. Typically, an invention disclosure would be made public only after claims were found to be allowable, whereupon the application would then be published as an issued patent. So it defies common sense to claim that applicants are required to show

that their inventions have support in the scientific community, when there was no requirement until recently that a patent applicant even disclose his invention to the public until such time as a patent issues.

The irony here is that, according to the Committee's nonsensical standard, the more pioneering the invention, the more difficult it will necessarily be to show "support in the scientific community." Yet these pioneering inventions are the ones most deserving of patent protection.

This requirement that Applicant show support in the scientific community was no doubt the motivation behind the Committee's demand that Applicant publish his scientific evidence of lower energy states of hydrogen in peer-reviewed journal articles. Despite the Committee's failure to cite any legal authority for that evidentiary standard, Applicant nonetheless complied with it. As previously stated, Applicant now has over 65 peer-reviewed articles published in respected scientific journals regarding the operation of his lower-energy hydrogen technology, thus demonstrating considerable support in the scientific community.<sup>103</sup> Thus, by the Committee's own admission, this accomplishment establishes Applicant's satisfaction of the enablement and utility requirements under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 101.

Indeed, the Committee initially touted the credibility of peer-reviewed journal articles in scientific debate. Of course, that was when it was criticizing Applicant's scientific evidence of lower-energy hydrogen predicted by his theory, prior to publication of that evidence, as "not having the credibility that peer-reviewed articles have." [See, for example, page 5 of the Committee's May 19, 2004 Office Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/352,693.] Now that Applicant's evidence has been widely published in peer-reviewed articles appearing in highly esteemed scientific journals, the Committee has the audacity to claim that his theory lacks support in the scientific community.

Consistent with its "allowance is not an option" policy, the Committee takes this extreme position even farther by claiming that Applicant's real-world evidence that

---

<sup>103</sup> As explained more fully below, Applicant has complied with the Committee's required showing of support in the scientific community despite attempts by his competitors to undermine that support by disparaging Applicant and his technology. The extent to which members of the Committee, including BMS President Souw, have knowledge of, or involvement in, such activities, that information is highly relevant to the issue of whether Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology has support in the scientific community and, therefore, must be disclosed.

lower-energy hydrogen actually exists “detract[s] from the central issue that the hydrino does not theoretically exist” and that “all of applicant’s data cannot prove what is not theoretically possible.” [See, for example, May 12, 2005 Advisory Action in U.S. App’n Ser. No. 09/669,877 at page 2 (emphasis added).] Thus, even when Applicant complies with the Committee’s “support in the scientific community” standard by submitting scientific evidence that has been peer-reviewed by highly qualified PhD’s scientists and accepted for publication in esteemed scientific journals, since, according to the Committee, that credible evidence is rejected because it supposedly “detracts” under a different patentability standard that improperly presumes his invention to be *per se* incredible.

Out of the multitude of unsupportable and conflicting patentability standards that the Committee has put forward over the years, this one truly stands out as perhaps the most outrageous. Applicant has spent enormous amounts of effort and money complying with the PTO’s unlawful requirement that he publicly disclose in peer-reviewed publications confidential data generated by Applicant and independent third parties to prove the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. The only way to now settle the debate on whether lower-energy hydrogen actually exists is to properly evaluate that real-world evidence. For the Committee to now assert that those efforts were for naught, since Applicant’s evidence “detract[s] from the central issue that the hydrino does not theoretically exist,” turns science on its head and is an embarrassment to a government agency charged with “promot[ing] the Progress of Science and useful Arts.” [See U.S. Constitution, Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 8.]

The Committee’s ridiculous position that it need not seriously analyze Applicant’s scientific data because the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is incredible based on an alleged theoretical impossibility—at least according to its misguided view of quantum mechanics—further violates well-established patent laws and procedures. Indeed, the PTO’s own procedures outlined in MPEP § 2107, p. 2100-31 require that the Examiner not start from the premise that an invention is “incredible,” by mandating that:

[The Examiner] should not begin an evaluation of utility by assuming that an asserted utility is likely to be false, based on the technical field of the invention or for other general reasons. . . . A conclusion that an asserted utility is incredible can be reached only after the Office has evaluated both

the assertion of the applicant regarding utility and any evidentiary basis of that assertion. The [Examiner] should be particularly careful not to start with a presumption that an asserted utility is, *per se*, "incredible" and then proceed to base a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 on that presumption.

Amazingly, when Applicant first criticized the Committee's error in refusing to consider Applicant's supporting evidence, under the presumption that the utility of his novel hydrogen technology is *per se* incredible, the Committee vehemently denied that it had ever taken the position that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen was impossible. Even the Committee's most prominent member, Examiner/BMS President Souw, has offered the same denial:

Contrary to Applicant's allegation on pg. 13, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph, lines 2-4, the PTO's view is not at all that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen were [sic] impossible, but instead, that (a) Applicant's invention is not supported by any experimental fact or evidence, and (b) the underlying theory (i.e., GUT/CQM) fails to support the invention, because it contains too many flaws. [See, for instance, Souw Appendix at p. 3 attached to the Committee's Final Office Action mailed August 24, 2004 in Applicant's U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,051 (emphasis added).]

The Committee, however, has contradicted itself by now readily admitting that it has dismissed the totality of Applicant's submitted scientific evidence based on the false presumption that "all of applicant's data cannot prove what is not theoretically possible." Applicant is hard pressed to imagine an approach to patent examination any more arbitrary and capricious than that.

In yet another blatant contradiction, the Committee resurrected its previously abandoned argument claiming that Applicant's novel hydrogen technology violates physical laws. When pressed to identify even a single law that is violated, the Committee continuously failed to do so. Apparently feeling the pressure to at least attempt to back up its claims, the Committee now relies upon the Krieg "reference"—actually a non-peer reviewed web page posted on the internet<sup>104</sup>—to allege that the "ground state of an electron of a hydrogen atom" is just such a law:

---

<sup>104</sup> Applicant has rebutted the Krieg web page arguments supposedly showing that the ground state of hydrogen is a physical law, without an effective response from the Committee. [See, e.g., pp. 140-42 of Applicant's Response filed January 17, 2006 in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/008,947.]

Applicant argues (page 20) that the "committee" has failed to identify "even a single physical law" which has been violated. In paper no. 40, referring to the Krieg reference, the Office has shown that Applicant's theory violates the physical law concerning the ground state of an electron of a hydrogen atom. On page 3 of his article (actually a webpage), Krieg uses an energy balance (potential + kinetic = total), the basic laws of electricity and magnetism, the uncertainty principle, and ordinary calculus to prove that the minimum energy level is the normally accepted "ground state." [See page 3 of the July 18, 2005 Final Office Action issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/008,947.]

The Committee's allegations are akin to the beliefs held by those who originally thought the earth was flat and that the sun revolved around the earth before breakthrough scientific evidence proved them wrong. The Committee is now in the embarrassing position of dismissing Applicant's scientific evidence demonstrating that the hydrogen atom can be made stable below the ground state because accomplishment of that feat supposedly violates a physical law forbidding such lower energy states. The Committee's circular reasoning, however, does not reflect well on a government agency charged with promoting the progress of science. If complying with physical laws is indeed the standard the Committee is applying, then surely it must condemn SQM, with all of its anomalies that have no basis in reality, and embrace Applicant's CQM, which is premised on compliance with physical laws even at the atomic level.

That would be true but for the fact that the Committee is not constrained by the same standards it unfairly applies against Applicant. Thus, according to the Committee:

Applicant's tentative recitation of E.H. Lieb's article is flawed and also misleading, since Lieb does not mention anything about hydrino. The fact that SQM contains parts that need improvement is scientifically acceptable, since (a) no physical theory is all encompassing, and (b) there would otherwise be no progress in science. [Page 18 of Souw Appendix A.]

This latest double standard further exposes the weakness of the Committee's case. When it comes to flawed, outdated quantum theory, upon which the Committee relies so heavily to support its position, the fact that it needs improvement is marginalized as "scientifically acceptable." Yet, the Committee requires that



Applicant's modern and more advanced theory that accurately predicts the existence of lower energy states be perfect in every detail—which it is—before it will deem Applicant's experimental evidence credible enough to be worthy of consideration. This clear double standard make a mockery of the Committee's examination of Applicant's hydrogen technology.

Put another way: How can the Committee on the one hand admit that outdated quantum theory "needs improvement," yet on the other, seriously claim that this flawed theory rises to the level of a sound "scientific principle" that serves as the basis for asserting that the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen predicted by Applicant's modern theory is "incredible"? This unsustainable, flawed position sounds the death knell for the Committee's rejections in all of Applicant's cases, which rejections should therefore be withdrawn immediately.

Furthermore, the Committee's assertion that Applicant's novel technology based on lower energy states of hydrogen violates physical law and thus can't possibly work even contradicts the express position taken by its conflicted lead Examiner, BMS President Souw. As noted above, when Applicant previously criticized the Committee for its failure to fairly consider Applicant's scientific evidence on the basis that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen was impossible, Dr. Souw took exception to that criticism claiming that "[t]he PTO's view is not at all that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen were [sic] impossible." [See, for instance, Dr. Souw's Appendix at p. 3 attached to the Committee's August 24, 2004 Office Action filed in Applicant's U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,051.] Clearly then, if Dr. Souw does not consider the existence of lower-energy hydrogen impossible, such lower energy states cannot be in violation of any physical law, much less the one now identified by the Committee as "the physical law concerning the ground state of an electron of a hydrogen atom." In now taking a contrary position, the Committee has unwittingly undermined the credibility of Dr. Souw and calls into question other views expressed by him.

The only consistency found throughout this myriad of contrived vague and double standards—and often no standards at all—is the Committee's use of each to excuse it from fairly considering and evaluating Applicant's scientific evidence that lower-energy hydrogen does indeed exist. The Committee prefers instead to engage in a theoretical

debate to the exclusion of that evidence, pitting its outdated quantum theory, with all of its far-fetched and disproved predictions, against Applicant's modern theory of classical quantum mechanics that correctly predicts the formation of lower-energy hydrogen.<sup>105</sup>

Applicant has willingly engaged the Committee in this theoretical debate, and will continue to do so if necessary, even though the patent laws do not require that an inventor understand the precise theoretical basis for why his invention works. All the law requires is that he disclose his invention in sufficient detail to enable one of ordinary skill in the art how to practice it. Applicant has done precisely that and the Committee has failed in its burden to show otherwise.

Of course, the debate over these competing theories can go on indefinitely without resolution, which may be the Committee's strategy. Engaging in that intellectual exercise, however, will not—indeed cannot—definitively settle the question of whether practicing Applicant's disclosed hydrogen chemistry results in the formation of lower-energy hydrogen. Like any good theoretical debate, this one can only be tested and ultimately settled by fully and fairly evaluating the unprecedented amount of real-world experimental evidence Applicant has submitted conclusively confirming the lower energy states of hydrogen. Applicant has expended tens of millions of dollars amassing this experimental evidence. The least the Committee can do is properly consider it.

In the few isolated instances in which the Committee has addressed Applicant's evidence, it offers far-fetched reasons for dismissing it without a fair hearing, again demonstrating its arbitrary and capricious approach to examination of his cases. One prominent example occurred early on during the February 21, 2001 Interview held in all of BlackLight's then-pending lower-energy hydrogen applications, which was led by Examiner Vasudevan Jagannathan—one of the few Committee members Applicant has been able to successfully identify. At that interview, Applicant had a brief opportunity to present some of his scientific evidence, including spectroscopic data that is extraordinarily reliable in identifying chemical compositions. Such data amounts to a

---

<sup>105</sup> Applicant's modern theory, which applies classical laws to the electron, not only solves everything Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Electrodynamics can do better using physical laws, but also solves problems that Quantum cannot do, such as solving for the masses of fundamental particles and predicting the acceleration of the expansion of the Universe. Applicant's modern theory can further solve, for example, all atomic and molecular orbital current density functions, the corresponding energies, the corresponding bond energies, and the bond parameters for all molecules.

"chemical fingerprint" that cannot be seriously disputed. Despite the conclusiveness of that evidence, Examiner Jagannathan dismissed it out of hand as nothing more than "a bunch of squiggly lines."

To put the absurdity of that comment in context, the PTO rationalized its withdrawal of BlackLight's five allowed patent applications, in part, by citing a January 12, 2000 article written by Dr. Robert Park, spokesman for one of Applicant's main competitors, the American Physical Society (APS). [March 22, 2000 Decision at page 7 (Attachment G).] In that article, Dr. Park made the following startling statements:

The energy states of atoms are studied through their atomic spectra—light emitted at very specific wavelengths when electrons make a jump from one energy level to another. The exact prediction of the hydrogen spectrum was one of the first great triumphs of quantum theory; it is the platform on which our entire understanding of atomic physics is built. The theory accounts perfectly for every spectral line.

There is no line corresponding to a "hydrino" state. Indeed there is no credible evidence at all to support Mills' claim. [See Attachment J at 4 (emphasis added).]

The incredible irony here—one that cannot be easily overlooked—highlights once again the extreme arbitrary and capricious approach the Committee has taken in examining this and other BlackLight applications. There is no question that the vitriol espoused by Dr. Park in his cited *Post* article was, at least, partially responsible for the PTO's suspect "eleventh-hour" withdrawal of the five allowed BlackLight applications from issue. And yet, despite the fact that the very article the PTO relies upon to deny Applicant his patents recognizes that spectroscopic data is extraordinarily reliable—indeed, the "platform on which our entire understanding of atomic physics is built"—the Committee nonetheless continues to cavalierly ignore or dismiss that same data when submitted by Applicant.

Out of exasperation, Applicant queried Examiner Jagannathan during the February 21, 2001 Interview as to what type and quality of evidence would convince him that lower-energy hydrogen exists. In response, the Examiner required that Applicant publicly divulge confidential information by publishing his experimental evidence in peer-reviewed scientific journals for that evidence to be considered reliable. As detailed

above, Applicant has more than met this newly created "publication" standard for considering his experimental evidence by submitting over 100 scientific papers for publication, even though the PTO's rules and procedures impose no such requirement. So far, over 65 of these papers have completed and passed the peer-review process conducted by highly qualified Ph.D. referees.

Applicant's experimental evidence has been extensively peer-reviewed and published in the following esteemed journals:

Applied Physics Letters  
Chemistry of Materials  
Electrochimica Acta  
European Journal of Physics D  
European Physical Journal: Applied Physics  
Fusion Technology Journal of New Materials for Electrochemical Systems  
IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science  
International Journal of Hydrogen Energy  
Journal of Applied Physics<sup>106</sup>  
Journal of Material Science  
Journal of Molecular Structure  
Journal of Optical Materials  
Journal of Plasma Physics  
Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics  
Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer  
Journal of New Materials for Electrochemical Systems  
New Journal of Physics  
Physics Essays  
Plasma Sources Science and Technology  
Solar Energy Materials & Solar Cells  
Thermochimica Acta  
Vibrational Spectroscopy

---

<sup>106</sup> Applicant notes that the *Journal of Applied Physics* is the very same journal cited by the Committee as credible evidence that Dr. Souw, one of its premier members, is supposedly qualified to evaluate Applicant's novel hydrogen technology. [See *infra*.]

Additionally, Applicant's experimental evidence has been submitted for peer-review and publication in the following esteemed journals:

Acta Physica Polonica A  
AIAA Journal  
Anuoles de la Fondation Louis de Broglie  
Brazilian Journal of Physics  
Canadian Journal of Physics  
Central European Journal of Physics  
Chemical Engineering Science  
Contributions to Plasma Physics  
Current Applied Physics  
Europhysics Letters  
Fizika A  
Foundations of Science  
Journal of Applied Spectroscopy  
Journal of Mathematical Physics  
Journal of Materials Research  
Journal of Physical Chemistry A  
Journal of Physical Chemistry B  
Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A  
Materials Characterization  
Materials Chemistry and Physics  
New Journal of Chemistry  
Physical Review B  
Physica Scripta  
Spectrochimica Acta Part B: Atomic Spectroscopy  
Thin Solid Films  
Vacuum

Once again, however, the Secret Committee has raised the bar to patentability by arbitrarily and capriciously ignoring this vast body of evidence that it required Applicant to submit. The Committee apparently believes that its anonymous members

are better qualified than the numerous skilled PhD's who peer-reviewed and approved the contents of Applicant's articles confirming the existence of lower-energy hydrogen.

The PTO's mishandling of the experimental evidence of record in this case is but one of several improper actions that have adversely effected Applicant's patent rights. Others include:

- (1) illegally withdrawing or threatening to withdraw other copending BlackLight patent applications from issue, after initially allowing all claims, under highly suspicious circumstances that suggest likely interference by BlackLight's competitors;
- (2) improperly examining this application by Secret Committee, effectively denying Applicant the right to confront the persons involved in that examination, to assess their qualifications and biases, and to ascertain whether those persons include BlackLight's competitors or other improper outside influences, in breach of PTO confidentiality requirements; and
- (3) refusing reasonable requests by Applicant and five U.S. Senators to divulge information relating to the events that triggered the PTO's withdrawal action, and the identity of all PTO employees and non-PTO personnel involved in examining BlackLight's applications.

These improper actions bear directly upon the prosecution of BlackLight's pending applications, yet Applicant's good faith efforts to discuss and resolve these and other outstanding issues have been either ignored or rejected out of hand. One of Applicant's many overtures was communicated directly to then PTO Director James E. Rogan in a letter dated December 21, 2001, from BlackLight board member Dr. Shelby T. Brewer. Dr. Brewer received his Ph.D. in Nuclear Engineering from M.I.T. and served as Assistant Energy Secretary in the Reagan administration.<sup>107</sup> [See Attachment A.]

As stated in his letter, Dr. Brewer's reasons for appealing to Director Rogan were motivated not only by his fiduciary duty to protect BlackLight's interests, but also by a sincere desire to avoid unnecessary embarrassment to the PTO over these lingering issues if left unresolved. Dr. Brewer appealed for a meeting with Director Rogan in an

---

<sup>107</sup> Other prominent Directors on BlackLight's board include: Michael H. Jordan, CEO of Electronic Data Systems, Vice Admiral Michael P. Kalleres, former Commander of the U.S. Second Fleet, General Merrill A. McPeak, former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, and Neil Moskowitz, CFO of Credit Suisse First Boston.

attempt to bring some closure to this matter in a way that might mutually benefit both sides.

Despite the urgency of his plea, Dr. Brewer waited over four months before finally receiving a response to his request for a meeting. In a curt letter dated April 24, 2002, from the Director's Chief-of-Staff, Jason C. Roe, the PTO advised: "We appreciate your interest in this matter, but, unfortunately, must decline your request for a meeting due to the fact that the USPTO is not in a position to discuss the issue at the present time." [See Attachment A.] The PTO's response, however, merely begs the question: if not now, when will it be in a position to have these discussions?

This negative response, while disappointing, was hardly surprising. In refusing to meet with Applicant, the PTO continues to treat prosecution of this and BlackLight's other copending cases as an adversarial proceeding. While the PTO may believe it is justified in shrouding its untoward actions under a cloak of secrecy and remaining answerable to no one, that approach does little to preserve public confidence in the patent process. Only by openly engaging Applicant in mutually beneficial discussions of all the issues in this case can the PTO ever hope to achieve that worthy goal. Applicant therefore implores the PTO to reconsider its policies and adopt a more flexible and cooperative approach by agreeing to meet with Applicant to discuss the handling of this and other pending BlackLight applications before taking any further action.

Perhaps the PTO sees no need to modify its approach, buoyed by the Federal Circuit's June 28, 2002 Decision upholding its withdrawal action that cancelled issuance of BlackLight's allowed patent applications. [See *BlackLight Power, Inc. v. Director James E. Rogan*, 63 USPQ2d1534 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (Attachment B).] The Federal Circuit ruled, among other things, that an "emergency situation" trumped the controlling regulation requiring the PTO to determine the unpatentability of one or more claims before it withdrew the '294 application from issue so that the PTO's mere "concern" over patentability provided adequate basis for the withdrawal. That Decision, aside from the

fact that it is erroneous,<sup>108</sup> does not even begin to resolve other issues that touch on the merits of this case.

One such issue is how this alleged “emergency situation” arose in the first place, *i.e.*, how the PTO became aware of BlackLight’s issued U.S. Patent No. 6,024,935 (the ‘935 patent) that supposedly raised “concerns” about other pending applications. That issue apparently was not important to Associate Solicitor Kevin Baer who defended the PTO’s conduct by arguing to the District Court: “I would even say, Your Honor, you could imagine in our head any scenario of how we learned about it. A blimp flying over us. It doesn’t matter, because what matters, Your Honor, is the decision [to withdraw] itself.” [May 22, 2000 Transcript at 52 (Attachment K, Tab E).]

Judge Sullivan, however, was apparently unimpressed by those comments, noting in footnote 10 of his opinion that he was “troubled by several steps in the PTO’s process” and advising the PTO to “examine its patent issuance process so that their normal operations are not compromised by such seemingly suspicious procedures.” [See 109 F.Supp. 2d 44, 53-54, n.10 (Attachment L).]

---

<sup>108</sup> Applicant believes that the Federal Court’s opinion is erroneous due, in part, to its misreading of a concurring opinion of one Justice in a 38-year-old Supreme Court case to support its holding that this supposed “emergency situation”—a finding that was not supported by the record or even argued by the PTO—justified the PTO’s withdrawing BlackLight’s copending ‘294 application from issue on February 17, 2000, after payment of the issue fee. See *BlackLight Power* at page 7 citing *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. v. United States*, 386 U.S. 372, 421 (1964) (Brennan, J., concurring) (recognizing the importance of leaving the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) great flexibility to deal with emergency situations to avoid serious damage to the national transportation system, but finding no pressing need that justified the ICC’s action). The Federal Circuit stretched that case way beyond the limits of Supreme Court precedent that requires government agencies to strictly follow statutory and regulatory guidelines.

Incredibly, at oral argument, the PTO did not even suggest that an emergency situation had forced it to withdraw this application from issue on February 17, 2000. To the contrary, PTO Solicitor John M. Whealan argued that no withdrawal—emergency or otherwise—occurred on that date and admitted that, if the Court found otherwise, his case would be seriously compromised. This was because, at that time, the PTO could not locate the patent file and admittedly could not have made a determination of unpatentability of one or more claims as required by the controlling regulation. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.131(b)(3); MPEP § 1308 (7<sup>th</sup> Ed., Rev. 1, Feb. 2000). To avoid an adverse ruling, Solicitor Whealan sought refuge outside the administrative record, suggesting for the first time that the PTO had used the wrong form in mistakenly notifying Applicant on February 17 that his application had been withdrawn. Then, again without evidentiary support, the Solicitor tried to convince a skeptical Court that Director Kepplinger, in consultation with the Examiner, had made an unpatentability determination sometime later, after Applicant had voluntarily supplied the PTO with a copy of the application—hardly an emergency situation if it were true.



While the PTO may be unconcerned how it learned of the '935 patent, Applicant considers that information critically important. If, for instance, competitors were somehow involved in events leading to the withdrawal of BlackLight's allowed applications and, perhaps, in the subsequent prosecution of those and other applications, that information would relate directly to the credibility of the rejections entered in those cases, including this one. Applicant therefore renews his request for a full accounting of how, out of the thousands of patents the PTO issues every week, his '935 patent came to its attention, thus leading to the withdrawal of BlackLight's allowed applications.

Applicant believes that concerns over outside influences on the prosecution of his applications are fully justified. Following the PTO's withdrawal action, counsel immediately investigated the facts and circumstances surrounding that action by questioning various PTO personnel. In discussions with Director Esther Keplinger, she admitted to counsel that the withdrawal was a reaction to perceived heat—a "firestorm" as she put it—the PTO had received from an undisclosed outside source. Director Keplinger further indicated that the withdrawal occurred only after BlackLight's '935 patent had been brought to the attention of then-Director Q. Todd Dickinson by Gregory Aharonian, another PTO outsider well known for publicly attacking issued U.S. patents.<sup>109</sup>

Director Keplinger's revelations are truly disturbing in that they describe what is essentially a newly created non-statutory reexamination procedure for opposing the issuance of patents never envisioned by Congress. *Compare* 35 U.S.C. §§ 301-307 (patent reexamination statutes).

Following the PTO's drastic withdrawal action, Applicant discovered other reliable information suggesting the likelihood of outside interference with BlackLight's patent applications and breaches of the PTO's duty to maintain the confidentiality of those applications. Applicant initially learned that Dr. Peter Zimmerman, former Chief Scientist for the State Department, had published an Abstract of an upcoming speech to

---

<sup>109</sup> See Applicant's February 28, 2000 letter to Director Keplinger documenting telephone and personal conversations between her and Applicant's counsel regarding improper outside influence that precipitated the withdrawal of BlackLight's five allowed applications. The PTO cited this letter in its March 22, 2000 Decision affirming its withdrawal action. [See Attachment G.]

the American Physical Society (APS)—a BlackLight competitor—boasting that his Department and the Patent Office “have fought back with success” against BlackLight. [See Attachment K, Tab C.] In conversations with BlackLight’s counsel, Dr. Zimmerman admitted that he had received information concerning BlackLight’s applications through e-mails from Dr. Robert Park, spokesman for the APS, who told him of a contact in the PTO referred to by Dr. Park as “Deep Throat” with access to confidential patent information. [See letter dated July 10, 2000 (Attachment K, Tab C).]

An *APS News Online* bulletin, dated August/September 2002, suggests that Dr. Park is maintaining his questionable PTO contacts, apparently with the agency’s blessing:

#### **APS E-Board Passes Resolution on Perpetual Motion Machines**

The APS Executive Board approved a resolution at its June 2002 meeting in Annapolis, MD, affirming the fraudulent nature of claims of perpetual motion machines.

The resolution was deemed necessary because of a recent increase in patent applications for such devices. Robert Park, APS Director of Public Information and author of the weekly electronic newsletter, “What’s New,” reported that the US Patent Office has received several patent applications for perpetual motion machines during the first six months of this year alone. [Park’s 2000 book, *Voodoo Science*, devoted considerable space to the phenomenon of such devices throughout history.] The text of the APS resolution follows.

The Executive Board of the American Physical Society is concerned that in this period of unprecedented scientific advance, misguided or fraudulent claims of perpetual motion machines and other sources of unlimited free energy are proliferating. Such devices directly violate the most fundamental laws of nature, laws that have guided the scientific progress that is transforming our world.

Copyright 2002, The American Physical Society.  
The APS encourages the redistribution of the materials included in this newsletter provided that attribution to the source is noted and the materials are not truncated or changed.

[Attachment Q (emphasis added).] Dr. Park’s knowledge of the number of pending patent applications filed in the PTO directed to a particular subject matter—information

that is supposedly kept confidential—raises additional questions as to his activities in interfering with the prosecution of U.S. patent applications.<sup>110</sup>

Of course, this should come as no surprise since Dr. Park has admitted his direct involvement in BlackLight's patent affairs, as evidenced by the September 6, 2002 issue of *What's New* he authored and published on the APS website:

The status of BlackLight Power's intellectual property is fuzzier than ever. BLP was awarded Patent 6,024,935 for "Lower-Energy Hydrogen Methods and Structures," a process for getting hydrogen atoms into a "state below the ground state". . . . You might expect these shrunk hydrogen atoms, called "hydrinos," to have a pretty special chemistry. Do they ever! Indeed, a second patent application titled "Hydride Compounds" had been assigned a number and BLP had paid the fee. Several other patents were in the works. That's when things started heading South. Prompted by an outside inquiry (who would do such a thing?), the patent director became concerned that this hydrino stuff required the orbital electron to behave "contrary to the known laws of physics and chemistry." The Hydride Compounds application [the '294 application] was withdrawn for further review and the other patent applications were rejected. [September 6, 2002 Online Newsletter of Dr. R. Park, *What's New* (Attachment C) (emphasis added).]

Dr. Park's startling admission was confirmed two weeks later in the September 20, 2002 issue of the *Online Newsletter* published by the James Randi Educational Foundation (JREF). In it, James Randi gleefully boasted about Dr. Park's contacting the Patent Office with the express purpose of sabotaging Applicant's patent rights:

But why, hard on the heels of re-examining other questionable patents (see three weeks ago on this page), would the Patent Office have happened upon this particular one [BlackLight's withdrawn '294 application], when there are so many in this category? The secret can be inferred from Bob Park's weekly column, where we find: "Prompted by an outside inquiry (who would do such a thing?) . . ." That rascal!

The very fact that the Patent Office has paid heed to the complaints that Park, the JREF, and others have made, speaks well for rationality. Let's hope that we can look forward to many quack devices and systems being re-evaluated. Let's see a lot more of this "extraordinary action" from the Director. As for BlackLight Power, says Park, "Their long-awaited IPO may have to wait a little longer." [September 20, 2002 Online Newsletter of the JREF, *Swift* (Attachment C) (emphasis added).]

---

<sup>110</sup> Not coincidentally, the Committee initially attacked the operability of Applicant's invention by mischaracterizing it as a "perpetual motion machine" and, therefore, *per se* unpatentable. The Committee quickly withdrew that line of attack after Applicant showed it was completely lacking in any merit.

Despite all of this overwhelming incriminating evidence of improper outside interference by competitors with an administrative patent proceeding—a possible criminal offense—the PTO continues to ignore this serious matter. Indeed, the PTO tries to deflect attention away from this incriminating evidence by addressing points that have nothing to do with Dr. Park's "Deep Throat" contacts at the PTO, or by advancing arguments that actually confirm his interference in the examination of Applicant's pending patent applications:

Applicant has made numerous references to a Dr. Robert Park, whom he alleges to have had contact with a "Deep Throat" in the Office (page 31), and to have had "direct involvement in Blacklight's patent affairs" (page 32), "Blacklight" being the name of applicant's business. While applicant argues (page 24) that "the PTO rationalized its withdrawal of Blacklight's five allowed patent applications, in part, by citing a January 12, 2000 article written by Dr. Robert Park", citing a published article hardly constitutes contact with the author. The reference to the present applicant in the article does not mean that Dr. Park had obtained confidential information from the Office, because applicant published an edition of his book, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, in January 2000. While applicant argues (page 32) that Dr. Park knew about several of applicant's applications, the knowledge of which "is supposedly kept confidential", the Washington Post article by Dr. Park which refers to applicant's patent and a second application set to issue two weeks thereafter was published on 18 August 2000, which was three days after the publication of the U.S. District Court decision (part of Attachment K) which referred in which these applications were mentioned (page 1 thereof). Thus, both articles written by Dr. Park appear to be based on information that was already made public at the two respective times that the articles were published. No "Deep Throat" or other improper contact would have been necessary. [See, for example, the November 21, 2005 Office Action filed in App'n Ser. No. 09/110,678 at p. 5; and the December 12, 2005 Advisory Action filed in App'n Ser. No. 09/110,694 at p. 5.]

The mention of Blacklight Power in the January 12, 2000 article referenced above was never put forward by Applicant as a basis for claiming Dr. Park had a "Deep Throat" contact at the PTO. It was cited merely to show the PTO's reliance on someone who, as shown by other evidence, had an agenda to sabotage Applicant's patent applications and who boasted about having done so.

When the Committee finally gets around to addressing one piece of that evidence Applicant used to show Dr. Park's receipt of illicit information from the PTO, the Committee misconstrues it in a way that actually supports Applicant's position. Specifically, as cited above, the September 2002 issue of the *APS News Online* bulletin suggests that Dr. Park has maintained his questionable contacts at the PTO well after Applicant's allowed applications had been withdrawn years earlier. Again, the APS states in that bulletin that: "Robert Park, APS Director of Public Information and author of the weekly electronic newsletter, "What's New," reported that the PTO has received several patent applications for perpetual motion machines during the first six months of this year alone." [Emphasis added.] Based on that eye-opening disclosure, Applicant argues, and rightfully so, that Dr. Park's knowledge of information that "is supposedly kept confidential"—referring not to Applicant's previously known applications, but to the unknown applications of others—raised additional questions as to his activities involving interference with the prosecution of U.S. patent applications.

The Committee confuses that evidence, and convolutes Applicant's arguments, in asserting that "Applicant argues (page 32) that Dr. Park knew about several of applicant's applications, the knowledge of which 'is supposedly kept confidential'." [Emphasis added.] Applicant has cited other evidence of Dr. Park's knowledge of applicant's applications, which, to date, the Committee has completely ignored. The evidence the Committee refers to above, however, demonstrates Dr. Park's "insider status" at the PTO by showing he had received illicit information about other applicants' filed applications in 2002. Thus, the fact that articles were written in 2000 about Applicant's applications or that applicant's applications due to issue in 2000 were otherwise mentioned has absolutely nothing to do with Dr. Park's knowledge in 2002 of different applications filed by others that year.

Due to the Committee's obvious confusion on this point, it erroneously concludes that "both articles written by Dr. Park appear to be based on information that was already public at the two respective times that the articles were published" and "[n]o 'Deep Throat' or other contact would have been necessary." To the contrary, Applicant has presented considerable evidence that, in fact, Dr. Park has had, and continues to maintain, improper contacts at the PTO based on Dr. Park's and Dr. Zimmerman's own

admissions discussed above regarding Dr. Park's knowledge of confidential PTO filings, including information pertaining to Applicant's pending patent applications. The least the Committee can do is fairly and accurately address that evidence, which it has yet to do.

In limiting its consideration to but a small fraction of that evidence, as mischaracterized above, the Committee nonetheless has at least acknowledged the relevance and seriousness of Dr. Park's improper contacts with the PTO. In making that case for Applicant, the Committee is obliged consider and respond to all of the evidence Applicant has presented on this important issue.

Apparently, this is not the first time that Dr. Park, James Randi and PTO officials have been embroiled in a patent controversy such as this one involving improper interference with a patent proceeding. Less than a year before Applicant's five allowed applications were withdrawn from issue in February 2000, the PTO was caught up in another scandal of sorts involving the issuance of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,748,088 and 6,011,476, granted on a device that can identify the obscured location of living entities. Following issuance of the '088 patent, Dr. Park published in his *What's New* newsletter inaccurate, disparaging remarks, which were picked up by James Randi on his JREF website, concerning the operation and reliability of the claimed invention. [Attachment H] An article published May 21, 1999 in *Science Magazine* during the pendency of the '476 patent also reported on the controversy and the involvement of Sandia National Labs (SNL) in the testing of the device. [Attachment D]

SNL's involvement and the disclosure of confidential information to David Voss, the author of the *Science* article, was itself the subject of some controversy and resulted in the issuance of an internal PTO memorandum that was placed in the '476 patent file. In that memorandum, the PTO felt compelled to reiterate its policy forbidding PTO employees from making public disclosures concerning pending patent applications:

**PTO MEMORANDUM FOR ALL EMPLOYEES: MEDIA CONTACT POLICY**

Posted Date: 06/25/99  
Removal Date: 07/06/99

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND  
TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

June 22, 1999

99-42

MEMORANDUM FOR All Employees

FROM: Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Acting  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

SUBJECT: Media Contact Policy

Since a memorandum on this subject was first issued several years ago, thousands of new employees have joined the PTO. Therefore, it is a good time to reiterate PTO policy concerning employee contact with members of the media including, but not limited to, those in print, broadcast, cable, and online publications.

All requests, including telephone and e-mail, from members of the media for interviews, tours, and appearances should be directed to the Office of Public Affairs (Richard Maulsby or Brigid Quinn). Public Affairs will then determine the appropriate Office response for such requests and arrange for all interviews and any other meetings with the media. A member of the Public Affairs staff may attend interviews and meetings.

This policy applies only to contact with the media, not to interactions with customers. Any questions about media contact should be directed to the Office of Public Affairs at 305-8341.

Additionally, MPEP section 1701 and TMEP section 1801 specify that Office personnel should not comment on the validity or enforceability of any U.S. patent or trademark registration. These sections also caution employees about answering other particular inquiries concerning U.S. patents or trademark registrations. Any questions on this policy should be directed to your supervisor or to the MPEP Editor at 305-8813 for patents or to the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks at 308-8900. [Attachment E]

Curiously, SNL is where Dr. Park previously served as head of its Surface Physics Division, leading Applicant to wonder whether SNL, or any of its sister labs, have had any similar involvement in the examination of this and other BlackLight

applications. Applicant's curiosity on this point is further heightened by the fact that Examiner Bernard Souw, a former employee with Brookhaven National Labs, is a premier member of the Secret Committee who has been engaged in the examination of BlackLight's patent applications for some time now. [See, e.g., App'n Ser. No. 09/513,768.] As discussed below, Examiner Souw's activities as lead scientist for a company he owns in competition with BlackLight, while examining BlackLight's patent applications, raises a genuine conflict of interest, thus adding further cause for concern over outside interference with Applicant's patent rights.

If, as Applicant suspects, the PTO has conferred with others having ties to the APS, like Dr. Park or Dr. Zimmerman, or to other BlackLight competitors in withdrawing or rejecting BlackLight's applications, that information would be highly relevant and thus must be disclosed. Obviously, knowing the identity and potential biases of all persons providing input or otherwise involved in rejecting BlackLight's applications, especially those with competing interests, bears directly on the credibility of those rejections. This point could not have been made more clear than the Committee's adoption of Examiner Souw's biased views in formulating its rejections in this case.

Applicant has, on numerous occasions, disclosed to PTO officials information relating to Dr. Park's undermining of BlackLight's patent rights, as relayed in Dr. Brewer's December 21, 2001 letter to then PTO Director Rogan, only to be ignored. [Attachment A; see also, for example, January 19, 2001 letter to Director Kepplinger (Attachment K ).] As Dr. Brewer explained in his letter, BlackLight is obviously concerned, among other things, that the PTO may have once again breached its duty to maintain confidentiality of U.S. patent applications under 35 U.S.C. § 122, 18 U.S.C. § 2071, 37 C.F.R. § 1.14, and M.P.E.P. § 101. The PTO's curt statement that it is "not in a position to discuss the issue at the present time" does little to allay those concerns.

Dr. Brewer further expressed in his letter distress over the suspected compromise of Applicant's patent rights to his novel hydrogen chemistry by a group of physicists with a vested interest in maintaining federal funding for projects based on a competing scientific theory and concern that those physicists continue to exert improper influence over the prosecution of BlackLight's pending applications. Those suspicions are only fueled by continued PTO silence on these issues while it undercuts Applicant's



patent rights based on statements of competitors like Dr. Park. For instance, in the March 22, 2000 Decision justifying its withdrawal of Applicant's allowed patent applications, the PTO relied, in part, on a *Washington Post* article written by Dr. Park only slightly more than a month prior to the withdrawal:

While petitioner in the accompanying letter points to favorable testimonials from scientists and entrepreneurs regarding the "revolutionary technology" that the instant application is asserted to embody, this does not establish that either the Director, Technology Center 1700, or the Director, Special Programs Law Office, committed reversible error, nor that the Notice should be withdrawn. In contrast, mainstream newspapers have reported this same "revolutionary technology" is accompanied by controversy in the scientific community. See Baard et al., Scientists and entrepreneurs have lots of ideas about new sources of energy; some may even be practical, *Wall St. J.*, Sept. 13, 1999, at R16; **Park, Perpetual motion; still going around, *Washington Post*, Jan. 12, 2000, at H3.** [March 22 Decision at 7 (Attachment G).]

Applicant is naturally skeptical that this timing was simply a coincidence. Regardless, the mere fact that the PTO would rely on any competitor to "bad-mouth" BlackLight's technology is troubling. That it relied on Dr. Park of all people, known for conducting "hatchet jobs" on new technologies that threaten federal funding for the physicists he represents, is contemptible.

The same *Washington Post* that ran Dr. Park's libelous article rebuked its less than credible author in a subsequent article confirming his reputation for engaging in what it described a "search-and-destroy mission" against inventors and scientists who seek to advance the bounds of science. [See Article dated June 25, 2000 (Attachment M).] To quote the article's exact words, "Park's anger permeates his rebuttals, which border on character assassination." [*Id.* At 1.] Noting that "thoroughness is not Park's strong suit," the article goes on to suggest that his intentions may be less than honorable:

Park's failure to gather first-hand data is unfortunate, but his selective omissions are far more serious. In at least one case, he violated basic principles of journalism and science itself by apparently suppressing information that conflicts with his foregone conclusion. . . .

Such tactics are reminiscent of the behavior of a zealous DA who is so convinced that a suspect is guilty that he feels entitled to withhold some information from the jury. [*Id.* at 1-2.]

Dr. Park's competitive motives in attacking BlackLight's novel hydrogen chemistry, and thereby undermining its patent rights, are clear, as further recognized by the *Post* article in its description of Dr. Park as "a Washington lobbyist and PR flack for the American Physical Society." The article goes on to warn of the serious effects a rush to judgment can have without first-hand review of experimental evidence:

This is a serious matter, since even poorly documented vitriol can jeopardize a scientist's reputation and future funding if it is disseminated with the complicity of a respected organization such as the American Physical Society. [*Id.* at 2.]

Dr. Park has admitted that there is merit to Applicant's argument that he is hostile to BlackLight, and therefore obviously biased against it, for competitive reasons. As discussed in his January 13, 2006 issue of *What's New* [Attachment C], Dr. Park explains the basis for his hostility:

We haven't heard much about Mills and his company, BlackLight Power, since they lost a patent appeal three years ago. (WN 6 Sep 02). But with the start of the new year, Dow Jones Newswires ran a story about deep-pocket financial gurus that are backing BlackLight. A retired head of energy banking at Morgan Stanley commented that physicists are "hostile" to Mills' ideas. Bob Park, was the only physicist quoted. Sure enough, he was hostile. "Park represents an entrenched physics establishment that fears losing billions in funding and having its work discredited," Mills explained. [See <http://bobpark.physics.umd.edu/WN06/wn011306.html> (Emphasis added).]

Dr. Park apparently takes great pride in being the only named physicist hostile to Mills' ideas and, in doing so, he gives credence to the underlying competitive motives for this hostility ascribed to him by Dr. Mills. Having conceded his obvious bias against BlackLight, it is highly inappropriate for the Committee to continue to cite and rely on his views in rejecting Applicant's patent applications.

Incredibly, in rationalizing its withdrawal action, the PTO paid tribute to a "hatchet man" like Dr. Park, who represents a competitor intent on sabotaging BlackLight's patent rights, by citing his hostile statements against BlackLight. Yet, in explaining the

issuance of BlackLight's '935 patent, the PTO publicly denigrates its entire examining corps, previously known for their careful study of experimental evidence in deciding whether to issue U.S. patents:

[P]atent examiners do review [patent applications]. Unfortunately, patent examiners are swamped and sometimes things slip through. [Statement of Associate Solicitor Baer in *BlackLight Power, Inc. v. Q. Todd Dickinson*, May 22, 2000 Tr. at 7 (Attachment K, Tab A).]

[E]xaminers are under tremendous pressure to produce work, and if they're going to approve [an application], they just approve it and kind of let it out the door. [May 22, 2000 Tr. at 48 (Attachment K, Tab A).]

As Dr. Brewer pointed out in his December 21, 2001 letter to Director Rogan, the PTO's outrageous public statements violate 35 U.S.C. § 282, under which statute all issued U.S. patents are presumed to be valid:

**Presumption of validity; defenses**

A patent shall be presumed valid. Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting such invalidity.

Underlying this fifty-year-old statutory presumption of validity is the premise of administrative regularity, which presumes that well-trained examiners with expertise in their respective fields properly carry out their examination duties by issuing only valid patents. See, e.g., American Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc., 725 F.2d 1350, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 1984). This presumption was, in fact, confirmed by the capable work of Examiners Langel and Kalafut who, with over 50 years of experience between them, examined and allowed Applicant's '935 patent, along with BlackLight's withdrawn applications.<sup>111</sup>

As succinctly stated in Dr. Brewer's letter, Solicitor Baer's statements on behalf of the PTO should be alarming to just about everyone, with the possible exception of

---

<sup>111</sup> The Examiners initially rejected all claims in these cases, but after conducting five lengthy personal interviews with Applicant and carefully considering Applicant's experimental evidence, they ultimately allowed those claims.

accused patent infringers, and most certainly do not reflect well on an agency charged with maintaining the integrity of the patent system. Applicant felt that a meeting with Director Rogan to secure a retraction of those statements would be mutually beneficial to both sides. Yet once again, inexplicably, the PTO was not, and presumably is still not, prepared to discuss this issue.

These and other unfair assaults on Applicant's patent rights leave him to ponder: What would motivate the PTO to conduct itself with such total disregard for U.S. patent laws and regulations governing its administrative authority just to attack this one Applicant?

Applicant's fear is that these attacks may be attributable to competitors, like Dr. Park, who are coordinating an organized smear campaign to discredit BlackLight's technology. That fear is only heightened by the PTO's hiding behind strained theoretical arguments as an excuse for refusing to fairly evaluate Applicant's experimental evidence, while using its Secret Committee to issue anonymous rejections in this and other BlackLight applications. Dr. Brewer also brought these issues to Director Rogan's attention as an agenda item for a meeting that, unfortunately, has never taken place.

Applicant has a right to know the identity and qualifications of all persons providing input to, or otherwise participating in, the examination process. This information bears directly on the credibility of the rejections that have been entered in this and other BlackLight applications. For instance, if Dr. Park or any of his physicist cronies have been consulted in denying Applicant his patent rights, it would certainly explain the arbitrary and capricious handling of the experimental evidence of record in those cases.

Particularly germane is the identity of all persons responsible for, or otherwise involved in, creating the Office Actions, Attachments, and Appendices that make up the record in this application and other BlackLight cases. To this day, the Committee has refused, without any adequate explanation, to provide this vital information to the detriment of Applicant.

Furthermore, Applicant is entitled to know which PTO officials are ultimately responsible for analyzing Applicant's scientific data evidencing the existence of lower-

energy hydrogen, and which officials have the final authority to decide the fate of BlackLight's applications. The Committee's unfair refusal to divulge that information has also seriously handicapped Applicant's ability to effectively respond to and overcome the rejections of record.

For instance, Applicant has been stymied on numerous occasions in attempts to discover the basis for various positions articulated by the Committee, or the status of certain actions it has taken. Seldom are the Examiners of record, who are mere signatories to the Committee's handiwork, or their immediate supervisors, able to give any useful guidance on those subjects, either because they have no authority to do so and cannot divulge who does or, in some cases, they do not know who even has custody of the patent file so as to investigate the answer to a particular question.

Knowing who is responsible for analyzing the record evidence would also allow Applicant to assess that person's qualifications, as compared to those Ph.D. scientists who have peer reviewed the published experimental evidence confirming lower energy states of hydrogen. Equally important, by knowing who has authority to issue BlackLight's applications, Applicant can more easily ascertain and satisfy the patentability standards being applied in rejecting claims to his novel hydrogen technology.

Illustrating this last point, Applicant attempted to force the Secret Committee to set reasonable standards by which his data could be accepted as reliable proof by requesting the personal Interview that was held on February 21, 2001. Of course, to effectively determine the standards being applied against Applicant, he first had to identify the person(s) responsible for setting those standards.

Applicant, however, was only partially successful in that effort. Prior to the February 21 Interview, Applicant's counsel uncovered the identity of only one Committee member, Examiner Vasudevan Jagannathan, who played a role in rejecting BlackLight's applications. Incredibly, Examiner Jagannathan initially denied any such involvement, accurately noting that his name did not appear anywhere in the record. He therefore refused counsel's explicit request that he attend the upcoming Interview. Only after counsel wrote to a high-level supervisor demanding that Examiner Jagannathan attend did counsel receive confirmation that the Examiner was "directly involved in the

creation of the Office Action” to be discussed at the Interview and that he would indeed attend. [See January 19, 2001 letter to Director Esther Kepplinger (Attachment K) and February 12, 2001 letter from Director Jacqueline M. Stone (Attachment N).]

Examiner Jagannathan confirmed his direct involvement by leading the Interview discussions. The Examiner's participation afforded Applicant an opportunity to assess his qualifications to examine and evaluate the experimental evidence of record. Applicant was astonished to hear Examiner Jagannathan basically admit he was unqualified to do so based on several of his comments. One of those comments, as discussed previously, included his characterization of Applicant's highly reliable spectroscopic data confirming lower energy states of hydrogen as a “bunch of squiggly lines.”

When pressed for guidance on what standards he used to evaluate Applicant's scientific data and to decide whether to issue his patents, Examiner Jagannathan would not elaborate. Rather, he proposed a new standard requiring Applicant to submit and publish his data in peer-reviewed journal articles before he would give it serious consideration. Despite strenuous objections to this newly minted standard requiring public disclosure of confidential information, Applicant has nonetheless worked diligently to comply with it.

Over the subsequent years, Applicant has used vast resources to present experimental evidence of lower energy states of hydrogen—much of it generated by independent third parties—in over 65 peer-reviewed articles published in the prestigious scientific journals mentioned above. Despite this significant accomplishment, the Committee, true to form, has essentially ignored that published evidence.

Even more impressive, Applicant has successfully met the Committee's new “publication” standard despite the attempts of another BlackLight detractor, Dr. Zimmerman, to undermine that effort by contacting various journals to dissuade them from publishing Applicant's articles. [See Attachment H.] Applicant's discovery of Dr. Zimmerman's latest subterfuge is especially alarming given that the Committee has cited non-peer reviewed statements by him—statements that were posted to an internet bulletin board of all places and that he readily admits are biased—to disparage

BlackLight's technology. [See, e.g., Applicant's Response to the Committee's 6/11/03 Office Action filed 12/10/03 in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/009,294.]

Aside from the fact that the Committee has relied on such non-peer reviewed materials posted to an internet chat group while, at the same time, requiring that Applicant's submitted materials be subjected to peer review—a double standard if there ever was one<sup>112</sup>—the Committee shows extreme bias and rather poor judgment in citing material from an arch cynic with a significant vested interest that he is openly protecting. As previously noted, Dr. Zimmerman's proclamations of his efforts to sabotage Applicant's patent rights are well known. The Committee needs no reminding that Dr. Zimmerman is the former Chief Scientist for the U.S. State Department who published an Abstract of a proposed APS speech boasting how his Department and the Patent Office "have fought back with success" against BlackLight. [See Attachment K, Tab C.] And again, it was Dr. Zimmerman who informed Applicant that his colleague, APS Spokesman, Dr. Park, has communicated with a PTO contact he refers to as "Deep Throat" with access to confidential patent information. [See *supra*.]

If, as Applicant suspects, the Committee has cooperated with Dr. Zimmerman, or other biased individuals, in denying Applicant his patent rights, while those same individuals have worked behind the scenes to undermine Applicant's compliance with the Committee's concocted publication requirement, then again, that information is highly relevant and should be disclosed without further delay. Such a scenario would be entirely consistent with the Dr. Zimmerman's prior admission proudly proclaiming his success in sabotaging Applicant's patent rights.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Not surprisingly, the Committee cannot explain why it required that all materials in support of Applicant's discovery of lower-energy hydrogen be submitted for peer review and publication in qualified scientific journals when biased statements taken from Applicant's competitors are not subjected to the same scrutiny. The Committee's imposition of this obvious double standard merely further highlights the arbitrary and capricious manner in which the Committee has handled this and other BlackLight applications.

<sup>113</sup> Having relied on Dr. Zimmerman's opinion to disparage Applicant's technology, the Committee is constrained to also address the issues raised herein regarding the efforts of Dr. Zimmerman and his APS colleagues—Dr. Park in particular—to sabotage Applicant's patent rights. The Committee's further requirement that Applicant's technology achieve "support in the scientific community" is also affected by Dr. Zimmerman's clandestine activities and, thus, warrants further investigation. In view of this onerous patentability requirement foisted upon Applicant, anyone who has influence with the Committee should not

Applicant is deeply concerned that the Committee has continued its questionable practice of cooperating with Applicant's competitors, including Dr. Zimmerman and Dr. Park, in thwarting Applicant's patent rights. This concern is only bolstered by its citation to Dr. Zimmerman's non-peer-reviewed, unsubstantiated comments appearing in his paper.<sup>114</sup> [See, e.g., Applicant's Response to the Committee's 6/11/03 Office Action filed 12/10/03 in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/009,294.] Prominently displayed on the front page of that paper is the following copyright notice:

This entire article is copyright 2001 by Peter D. Zimmerman. No forwarding, reposting, copying, excerpting or direct quotation **whatsoever**, even for the purpose of reviews, or storage in any data base or storage system other than the HSG files on Yahoo.com or on the author's personal computer is permitted without the express written permission of the author.

© Peter D. Zimmerman, 2001. All rights reserved. [Emphasis in original.]

Applicant must assume that the PTO, an agency obviously well versed in intellectual property rights, would not have willfully violated the terms of Dr. Zimmerman's copyright notice. Thus, it must be presumed that the agency has been in contact with Dr. Zimmerman, at the very least to secure his permission to reproduce this paper, if not to secure his cooperation in others ways that continue to undermine Applicant's patent rights. Applicant is entitled to know the extent of those contacts and the nature of any communications between the PTO and either Dr. Zimmerman or his colleague Dr. Park.

Applicant is hardly surprised by his inability to break the PTO's code of silence on the suspicious handling of BlackLight's applications given that the PTO is also stonewalling similar inquiries from five U.S. Senators—four of whom requested that

---

be using the internet to disparage Applicant's technology and, most certainly, should not be relied upon for his opinions.

<sup>114</sup> Dr. Zimmerman's paper, entitled, "An Analysis of Theoretical Flaws in So-Called Classical Quantum Mechanics and of Experimental Evidence against CQM" has no merit whatsoever. Applicant notes that the Committee has ignored Dr. Mills' extensive rebuttal arguments to Dr. Zimmerman's paper posted in the same internet chat room that Dr. Zimmerman posted his paper. Applicant has provided the Committee with Dr. Mills' rebuttal on numerous occasions, but has yet to receive its response to his arguments, which should given the same level of reliability accorded Dr. Zimmerman's unpublished comments. [See Attachment I.]



Senator Patrick Leahy, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee overseeing the PTO, and/or Commerce Secretary Donald Evans, look into this matter. [See letters to and from Senators Max Cleland, Robert Torricelli, Jon Corzine, Ron Wyden, and Gordon Smith (Attachment O).] The PTO's continued refusal to cooperate in response to Senate inquiries suggests that, perhaps, it has something to hide.<sup>115</sup>

If the PTO looks to the Federal Circuit's June 28, 2002 Decision for license to continue its unfair and dilatory prosecution through secret examination, it will not find it. Indeed, Judge Newman, in rationalizing her ruling, incorrectly assumed that the PTO would fairly and expeditiously prosecute BlackLight's applications:

Such action must of course be reasonable under the circumstances and rare in occurrence, lest the emergency become the rule. But when necessary in order to fulfill the PTO's mission, with safeguards to the interests of the applicant including fair and expeditious further examination, we agree with the district court that the action taken is a permissible implementation of the statute and regulation. [See *BlackLight Power* at pages 1537-38 (Attachment B) (Emphasis added).]

Nothing could be further from the truth. As documented by Applicant, the PTO's prosecution of BlackLight's applications has been nothing short of hostile and its attempt to hide the mistreatment of Applicant behind the authority of a Secret Committee only exacerbates the unfairness of those actions and the lack of adequate safeguards. Worse yet, the Committee's lead examiner, Dr. Souw, now takes an extreme position that misconstrues the Federal Circuit's June 28, 2002 Decision, and the underlying D.C. District Court Decision, on a purely procedural issue, *i.e.*, whether the PTO could properly withdraw an allowed application after payment of the issue fee, and transforms those cases into rulings on the merits of Applicant's invention that supposedly support Dr. Souw's § 101 and § 112, ¶1 rejections. [See, e.g., 11/14/05 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/813,792 at 14, 17.] No doubt the Federal

---

<sup>115</sup> In the PTO's reply to the Senators' inquiry letters, Robert L. Stoll, Administrator for External Affairs, contended that any comments in response to those inquiries would be "inappropriate" because of the then-pending appeal to the Federal Circuit in *BlackLight Power Inc. v. Dickinson*, Civ. No. 00-0422 (D.D.C). [See Attachment O.] Putting aside the fact that the issues then on appeal had absolutely nothing to do with the points of inquiry, this contrived excuse has gone stale as the Federal Circuit decided that case many years ago in June 2002. [See Attachment B.] By its own statements, nothing now prevents the PTO from cooperating with the U.S. Senate regarding the administrative irregularities brought to its attention.

Circuit and District Court Judges who delivered the procedural rulings in those cases would be surprised to learn that Dr. Souw, who competes with Applicant as President of BMS Enterprise while examining his pending patent applications, would proffer such a blatant mischaracterization.

Because this untenable situation has failed to provide the safeguards to the interests of Applicant, including the fair and expeditious further examination contemplated by the Federal Circuit in its Decision, Applicant has herein requested an equitable remedy that the PTO immediately issue all five of the withdrawn BlackLight applications that gave rise to that Decision. [See Demand for Information and Redress, *infra*.]

Applicant strongly urges the PTO to break its silence and to engage in an open and honest discussion of these issues that continue to plague the examination of BlackLight's pending applications. To this end, Applicant renews his earlier offer, as expressed in Dr. Brewer's December 21, 2001 letter, to meet with the PTO Director and/or any other government officials, anywhere, anytime, to resolve these outstanding issues. Applicant sincerely hopes that the Director will likewise commit himself to achieving the same objective so that a fair and expeditious prosecution of all of BlackLight's applications that safeguards Applicant's interests, as envisioned by the Federal Circuit, can be achieved with mutually beneficial results.

Part of that forward movement should include a complete and proper consideration of Applicant's overwhelming experimental evidence confirming the utility and enablement of Applicant's novel hydrogen technology. In view of that evidence, Applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 are misplaced and should be withdrawn, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

#### **Discussions Held And Agreements Reached During The February 11, 2003 Interview**

The above-mentioned problems associated with the Secret Committee's examination of this and other BlackLight applications can be summarized as follows based on its failure to:

- (1) identify all persons from within and outside the Patent Office who contributed to, or were otherwise involved in, withdrawing or rejecting BlackLight's applications;
- (2) identify those persons having ultimate authority to analyze the vast body of experimental evidence demonstrating the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen and, based on that analysis, for deciding whether to issue patents on Applicant's novel hydrogen technology;
- (3) establish and apply consistent patentability standards and guidelines by which that patentability decision is to be made; and
- (4) properly analyze the evidence of record—now published, or to be published, in over 65 peer-reviewed journal articles—that the Committee required Applicant to submit.

The Committee merely perpetuated those failures in its previous Office Actions by dismissing, without serious analysis, Applicant's submitted data evidencing lower energy states of hydrogen. Frustrated by the Committee's inaction, but still determined to get a fair and expeditious hearing, Applicant requested and received the courtesy of another personal Interview, held February 11, 2003, to present his evidence and to discern the standards by which the ultimate decision-maker would be evaluating it.<sup>116</sup>

To that end, Applicant repeatedly requested that Examiner Jagannathan attend the Interview, since he had led the prior Interview held February 21, 2001, and, despite attempts to keep his identity secret, he was the only person known at the time to have been directly involved in creating the substantive Office Actions of record. Specifically, Applicant sought to question Examiner Jagannathan on why he still refused to accept Applicant's scientific data evidencing lower-energy hydrogen after it had been published, or was soon to be published, in what was then over 40 (now over 65) peer-reviewed journal articles, which he himself had required. Applicant, however, never got the chance to pose that question. Without explanation, Examiner Jagannathan refused

---

<sup>116</sup> Although the Interview Summary does not specifically list the serial number of all BlackLight applications as being the subject of the February 11, 2003 Interview, Examiners Langel and Kalafut agreed beforehand that the Interview would be held to address the similar rejection of claims in all assigned BlackLight cases based on an alleged lack of utility and inoperability.

to attend the Interview, just as he had refused to attend the Interview held two years earlier—only this time, he did not show up.

Applicant also requested that Examiners Wayne Langel and Stephen Kalafut attend the Interview, since they had previously allowed the five BlackLight applications that were mysteriously withdrawn from issue and their names were the only ones appearing in the record as signers of the substantive Office Actions under consideration. Examiners Langel and Kalafut did appear for the Interview, together with their immediate supervisors, SPE's Patrick Ryan and Stanley Silverman. Examiner William Wayner, who was assigned to one BlackLight application prior to his retirement from the PTO and who expressed an interest in attending the Interview, also appeared.

Also attending the Interview and leading the discussions on the PTO's behalf was Quality Assurance Specialist Douglas McGinty, who until that time had never been identified to Applicant as having played any role in the examination of his applications.

Attending the Interview on behalf of BlackLight Power were the inventor, Dr. Randell L. Mills, his counsel, Jeffrey S. Melcher and Jeffrey A. Simenauer, and company Director Dr. Shelby Brewer.

Also attending the Interview as an observer at Applicant's request was Ted C. Liu, Senior Legislative Assistant for Congressman David Wu, who represents the 1<sup>st</sup> District of Oregon.

During the Interview, Applicant made a sincere effort to advance the prosecution of his applications and to find common ground upon which all of these cases, once again, would be allowed to issue as patents. Applicant believed it was a worthwhile effort in light of Examiner Langel's statements on the record reaffirming his consistent view that Applicant's novel hydrogen technology is fully operable and, therefore, entitled to patent protection. The Interview was also significant in view of the following representations and agreements that resulted from the discussions between Applicant and lead-Specialist McGinty:

- (1) Applicant will identify the scientific data supporting lower energy states of hydrogen generated and furnished by independent third parties;

- (2) the Examiners whose signatures appear on the rejections of record, *i.e.*, Examiners Langel, Kalafut, and Wayner, have full authority to review that data and, based on their review, to issue patents as deemed appropriate; and
- (3) Applicant will confer with the signatory Examiners, either by telephone or in person, to review each assigned application on a claim-by-claim basis to ensure that the scientific data presented adequately supports the scope of the claims. For those claims determined to be adequately supported by the data, a patent will issue. For any claims deemed to be inadequately supported, Applicant reserves the right to continue seeking that broader claim coverage in subsequent proceedings.

Applicant appreciated the guidance Specialist McGinty provided during the Interview for securing BlackLight's patents. Based on that guidance, Applicant presented comments in two pending applications for which Responses were due detailing the substance of discussions held at the Patent Office on February 11<sup>th</sup> and identifying the independent, third-party data per agreement (1) above, which information is reproduced below. [U.S. App'n Ser. Nos. 09/110,678 and 09/362,693.]

Applicant's comments confirmed Examiner Langel's long-held view that the claims in those cases were in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requested that Examiner Langel exercise his authority to issue a Notice to that effect per agreement (2) above so that patents could then be issued.

Following up on the Responses filed in those pending applications per agreement (3) above, Applicant arranged for an Interview with Examiner Langel to review the cases on a claim-by-claim basis to ensure that the scientific data presented adequately supported the scope of the claims in those cases. In fact, Applicant and Examiner Langel reached a tentative understanding that certain claims were adequately supported by the data and that Applicant was therefore entitled to his patents.

Unfortunately for Applicant, that understanding was short lived after Examiner Langel, "for moral and ethical reasons," agreed under the most grievous of circumstances to his removal from examining all BlackLight applications to which he was assigned. Applicant was dismayed to further learn from Examiner Langel that

the PTO has adopted an "allowance is not an option" policy with respect to all pending BlackLight applications. Before discussing the prejudicial ramifications of these unfortunate incidents, however, Applicant presents the following recap of the discussions held during the February 11, 2003 Interview that lead to the above agreements.<sup>117</sup>

Just prior to the Interview, Specialist McGinty asked that Mr. Liu speak by telephone with Talis Dzenitis, a Congressional Affairs Specialist in the PTO's Legislative and International Affairs Office, to discuss his reasons for attending. Mr. Liu explained to Specialist Dzenitis that a constituent associated with BlackLight had contacted Congressman David Wu complaining of the irregular procedures the PTO has used in examining the company's pending patent applications. The procedures complained of included the PTO's withdrawal of the five applications approved by Examiners Langel and Kalafut for issuance as patents and the subsequent rejection of those and other BlackLight applications by an unknown group of PTO officials referred to by Applicant as a "Secret Committee."

Specialist Dzenitis represented to Mr. Liu that no such secret committee existed at the Patent Office. Applicant was surprised by that representation considering that a group of anonymous PTO officials were known to be handling BlackLight's applications and drafting the substantive Office Actions that the Examiners of record were instructed to sign.

Examiner Langel confirmed as much in an extended discussion he had with Mr. Liu and Applicant's counsel following the formal phase of the Interview. During that discussion, Examiner Langel repeated his prior denials of having authored the substantive Office Actions of record in the BlackLight applications to which he was assigned, even though those Actions bear his signature. Examiner Langel also repeated his previously expressed views that Applicant is entitled to patents on his novel hydrogen technology and that he wanted to issue those patents. Examiner Langel explained, however, that other PTO officials unknown to him having higher

---

<sup>117</sup> Much of the substance of these discussions was confirmed in e-mail correspondence between Mr. Liu and Applicant's Counsel. [See Attachment P.]

authority were responsible for drafting the substantive Office Actions he signed and for deciding whether to issue Applicant his patents.

The only person Examiner Langel could identify for Mr. Liu as “having something to do with the Office Actions” was Examiner Jagannathan, whose name does not appear on any Office Action. As noted above, Examiner Jagannathan kept his identity a secret from Applicant until counsel exposed his direct involvement in creating the Office Actions of record and forced him to attend the prior Interview that he led on February 21, 2001. [See January 19, 2001 letter to Director Esther Keplinger (Attachment K) and February 12, 2001 letter from Director Jacqueline M. Stone (Attachment N).] When the recent February 11, 2003 Interview started, it was Specialist McGinty, another previously unidentified PTO official, who led the discussion.

Following the telephone conversation with Specialist Dzenitis, in which he denied the existence of a secret committee, Mr. Liu joined the Interview already in progress. Applicant began the Interview with a general discussion of his novel hydrogen technology and a presentation of the experimental evidence confirming its operation and utility. Specifically, Applicant explained to the PTO officials in attendance how independent laboratory studies, including those conducted by a leading Los Alamos researcher and by a NASA funded group, as well as other highly reliable scientific data, demonstrate the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen underlying his technology.

At no time during Applicant's presentation did the PTO officials analyze or otherwise address to any significant degree the merits of that data proving the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. Rather, these officials—with the exception of Examiner Langel—raised non-technical arguments, similar to those raised in the pending Office Actions, why lower-energy hydrogen could not exist and, thus, why they were justified in according the real-world data little or no weight.

The first such argument, raised by Examiner Wayner, was based on unrelated technologies that have been subjected to ridicule in the scientific community, such as perpetual motion, cold fusion, and 100-miles-per-gallon carburetors. Examiner Wayner compared those controversial technologies to BlackLight's novel hydrogen chemistry and then asked Applicant: “How is your invention any different?”

Applicant pointed out significant differences. Unlike the far-fetched inventions mentioned by Examiner Wayner, Applicant explained that his inventions have been actually reduced to practice, as demonstrated by the many working prototype energy cells developed over the past ten years and the novel chemical compounds produced by the process, which were made available to the PTO in the past and again during the Interview. In fact, Applicant invited the PTO officials to visit his laboratory in Cranbury, New Jersey at his expense and to witness the operation of his energy cells for themselves, but like prior invitations, this one too was ignored.<sup>118</sup>

Applicant further distinguished his claimed inventions based on the substantial body of experimental evidence that corroborates the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen. Again, none of the PTO officials who raised non-technical arguments questioning the operability of Applicant's novel hydrogen technology made any real attempt to analyze that corroborating evidence. Indeed, Examiner Wayner frankly admitted that his background was in mechanical engineering and, therefore, he was not qualified to conduct such an analysis.

Examiner Wayner also questioned why, if BlackLight's technology was such an important discovery, the company had not yet developed a commercial device for producing energy. Applicant explained that the high cost of developing commercial products was an impediment and that, because BlackLight was not well-suited to undertake such development, it was looking to license patents on its technology to other companies to commercially exploit that technology.

Concerned that Examiner Wayner might be introducing yet another new patentability standard, requiring the sale of a commercial product, counsel pressed the Examiner on whether that was his intention. Examiner Wayner plainly stated it was not

---

<sup>118</sup> Dr. Shelby Brewer, a BlackLight Director and former Assistant Secretary of Energy in the Reagan Administration, first invited PTO officials to visit BlackLight's laboratory in Cranbury, New Jersey to "witness first hand our working prototypes of Dr. Mills' energy cell and his assortment of novel hydride compounds exhibiting unusual properties" in his December 21, 2001 letter addressed to then-Director James E. Rogan. [Attachment A] Although the PTO has been frequently reminded of this open invitation, it has stubbornly refused to accept or even acknowledge it.



and, in response to a specific question from Mr. Liu, affirmed that Applicant need not prove commercial applicability to secure a patent for his invention.<sup>119</sup>

Applicant also became alarmed when Examiner Wayner, in referring generally to BlackLight's "detractors," invoked only the name of APS lobbyist and spokesman Dr. Robert Park as someone who disputes the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen.<sup>120</sup> Applicant's counsel wanted to raise issues relating to Dr. Park's "Deep Throat" contact in the Patent Office and his reputation for conducting "hatchet jobs" on new technologies that threaten his lobbying of hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of the APS to federally fund its pet projects. [See *supra*.] Specialist McGinty, however, cut counsel off, refusing to discuss the matter. When Specialist McGinty suggested that BlackLight has a "similar agenda," noting its recent NASA contract, Applicant corrected him, explaining that BlackLight does not receive any government funding for its research. Specialist McGinty had no response and the discussion moved onto other, less controversial subjects.

Examiner Wayner raised other issues regarding the reliability of the scientific evidence presented by Applicant. That evidence included spectroscopic data, which counsel described as being equivalent to a "chemical fingerprint." Counsel further noted that Dr. Park himself, whom Examiner Wayner identified as BlackLight's chief

---

<sup>119</sup> Despite these assurances, Applicant is proceeding under the assumption that the PTO is requiring proof of commercial viability before it will issue him any patents on his novel hydrogen technology, especially in light of his discovery that the Committee now takes the position that "allowance is not an option" in BlackLight's cases. [See *infra*.] Issuance of Applicant's patents, however, should not be delayed while awaiting his own commercial development of that technology, especially now that Applicant has learned that at least one foreign company is nearing introduction of a product based on Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology into the U.S. market. Applicant is entitled to his patents to exclude that company and others from commercially exploiting that technology absent the payment of royalties that would be due under those patents.

<sup>120</sup> To Applicant's astonishment, in the Office Actions issued in Examiner Wayner's one assigned case, the Committee has continued to cite Dr. Park's biased statements against Applicant as a basis for rejecting claims in this case:

The opinion of Robert Park set forth in the Examiner's action of 4/14/00, paper #16. i.e. "But according to the country's leading organization of academic physicists, Mills' hydrino theory has no credibility. "There is virtually nothing that science does not know about the hydrogen atom," said Robert Park, director of the Washington [sic] office of the American Physical Society. "The ground state is defined as the (energy) state below which you cannot go ... the thought there is some state below the ground state is kind of humerous [sic]." [See 4/26/04 Office Action at p. 4 in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/181,180.]

antagonist, has proclaimed the extraordinary reliability of spectroscopic data. [See *supra*.]

Yet when Applicant tried to present this highly reliable spectroscopic data at the Interview showing the spectral lines corresponding to lower-energy hydrogen, *i.e.*, a “hydrino” state, Examiner Wayner interrupted, commenting that “spectroscopic lines are meaningless” and “don’t mean a hill of beans” to him. That comment was reminiscent of a previous one by Examiner Jagannathan characterizing Applicant’s spectroscopic data as “a bunch of squiggly lines.” [See *supra*.]

Counsel again became concerned that BlackLight’s applications were being evaluated using rather loose patentability standards. Counsel therefore requested that the PTO officials provide some guidance regarding the evidentiary requirements they were imposing on Applicant. Specialist McGinty and Examiner Wayner at first did not respond directly to Counsel’s request for guidance, but rather began questioning the accuracy of the test data Applicant submitted to confirm the existence of lower energy hydrogen.

Applicant explained that the submitted test data was generated by highly qualified Ph.D. scientists, many of whom represent independent laboratories. Applicant further noted how this data had been extensively peer-reviewed in the 40-plus (now over 65) articles published, or soon to be published, in prestigious scientific journals, including the *Journal of Applied Physics*. Applicant also provided Specialist McGinty—much to his surprise—with specific data showing the lower-energy state spectral lines that were published in the prestigious spectroscopic publication, *Journal of Molecular Structure*.

Applicant was astounded by the refusal of Specialist McGinty and Examiner Wayner to accept the reliability of the scientific data appearing in these published journal articles, especially considering the PTO’s routine acceptance of evidence submitted in printed publications to overcome utility rejections. See, *e.g.*, MPEP § 2107.01 (VI) pp. 2100-33 (“An applicant can [submit evidence in response to a utility rejection] using any combination of the following: amendments to the claims, arguments or reasoning, or new evidence submitted in an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, or in **a printed publication**.” (emphasis added)).

Counsel also reminded the PTO officials of the standard imposed by lead-Examiner Jagannathan during the previous Interview held February 21, 2001 that conditioned his consideration of evidence of lower-energy hydrogen on its publication in peer-reviewed journal articles based on the reliability of the peer-review process. Counsel then noted once again that, despite Examiner Jagannathan's failure to provide legal authority for imposing this unreasonable standard, Applicant had not only met it, but had exceeded it with over 40 (now over 65) journal articles. Having done so, counsel expressed extreme frustration with the PTO's continued refusal to seriously analyze the published scientific data based on manufactured excuses, such as this newly concocted one concerning the accuracy of Applicant's data.

Specialist McGinty raised yet another weak excuse for ignoring the published data by asking what assurances Applicant could provide that the journal articles had been actually peer reviewed! Mystified by that question, Applicant could only state what is a simple known fact: to get scientific data published in a journal article, it must first go through a rigorous peer-review process. Indeed, many of Applicant's articles went through numerous drafts and required further experimentation as directed by the Ph.D. scientists who peer reviewed those articles.

At that point in the Interview, Specialist McGinty admitted that, like Examiner Wayner, he was not qualified to analyze the published data. Applicant was surprised by that admission, since the Interview was being led by Specialist McGinty and had been arranged for the express purpose of presenting the experimental evidence of record.

Examiner McGinty's admission merely fueled Applicant's prior concerns that his published scientific data was not being properly considered, prompting counsel to ask who was responsible for analyzing that data. Specialist McGinty replied by stating that Examiners Langel and Kalafut, the Examiners of record, had that responsibility. That too came as a surprise since Examiners Langel and Kalafut were the ones who had originally reviewed Applicant's experimental evidence in allowing the five BlackLight applications that were subsequently withdrawn from issue. Applicant, however, was relieved to learn that these two Examiners, who had over 50 years of experience between them and who were obviously qualified to analyze the published data, were being reassigned that task.

Counsel then addressed the vexing problem of constantly changing patentability standards that had been plaguing the examination process. Counsel specifically mentioned, for example, the prior Office Actions that claimed Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology violated known laws of physics and chemistry without specifically identifying even one such law, and then required Applicant to prove otherwise.

Counsel also cited a recent Office Action dismissing Applicant's scientific data out of hand for failing to prove the invalidity of quantum theory:

The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejection . . . because there is no evidence presented which would prove applicant's contention that the theory of quantum mechanics is invalid."  
[October 7, 2002 Advisory Action entered in U.S. Serial No. 09/110,717.]

When Specialist McGinty accused Applicant of putting a "spin" on the Examiner's rejection, counsel noted that he had been reading the above quotation directly from the Office Action.

Counsel also mentioned other recent Office Actions filed in BlackLight cases that dismissed Applicant's recent submission of peer-reviewed journal articles, in accordance with the standards imposed by Examiner Jagannathan, as being merely "cumulative" when it clearly was not and even the originally submitted evidence had not been properly analyzed.

Expressing frustration over the PTO's failure to provide any consistent patentability standards to guide Applicant, counsel once again requested that Specialist McGinty provide such guidance. Specialist McGinty again raised concern over the integrity of the experimental evidence, but indicated that he would be more receptive to that evidence if it was validated by independent third parties.<sup>121</sup>

Applicant explained to Specialist McGinty that much of the evidence submitted over the previous four years was, in fact, generated by independent third parties. Applicant then began citing examples of the extensive independent third-party evidence

---

<sup>121</sup> Just as Specialist McGinty sought assurances at the February 11 Interview that persons involved in generating and furnishing the scientific data submitted by Applicant are independent and unbiased, Applicant deserves similar assurances that those involved in rejecting BlackLight's applications are also independent and unbiased. Despite Applicant's repeated requests for such assurances, none have been given. The genuine conflicts of interest uncovered by Applicant involving Examiner Souw and his clearly biased views against BlackLight adopted by the Committee merely underscore the importance of this highly relevant information.

disclosed in publications previously cited to the PTO, as well as more recently generated evidence that was subsequently submitted.<sup>122</sup> Specialist McGinty did not respond, whereupon counsel noted that the PTO's unfounded concern that the record evidence lacked third-party validation merely demonstrated its failure to thoroughly analyze that evidence.

Further demonstrating a lack of familiarity with the record evidence, Specialist McGinty criticized Applicant's experimental evidence as a whole by referring numerous times to only high-power plasma data. Applicant repeatedly pointed out that the plasma data was but a small fraction of the submitted evidence and that it was presented primarily to provide additional support for his plasma-related applications.

Applicant noted that the vast body of other scientific data he submitted relates to a broad range of analytical studies demonstrating the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen. For example, regarding those applications relating to novel chemical compounds, Applicant pointed Specialist McGinty to the extensive spectroscopic data supporting the identification of those compounds. Specialist McGinty, however, apparently did not understand the significance of that data, stating that the NMR data confirming lower-energy hydrogen could have been due to nitrogen. Applicant had to explain that, as a matter of basic scientific knowledge, NMR data only shows protons and that no other element but hydrogen is in the data range. Applicant also explained that the NMR data confirms the presence of an internal energy source.

---

<sup>122</sup> See R. L. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Identification of Compounds Containing Novel Hydride Ions by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 9, (2001), pp. 965-979.

R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, X. Chen, J. He, "New Power Source from Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Atomic Hydrogen that Surpasses Internal Combustion", J. Mol. Struct., Vol. 643, No. 1-3, (2002), pp. 43-54.

J. Phillips, R. L. Mills, X. Chen, "Water Bath Calorimetric Study of Excess Heat in 'Resonance Transfer' Plasmas", Journal of Applied Physics, submitted.

A. J. Marchese, P. M. Jansson, J. L. Schmalzel, "The BlackLight Rocket Engine", Phase I Final Report, NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts Phase I, May 1-November 30, 2002, [http://www.niac.usra.edu/files/studies/final\\_report/pdf/752Marchese.pdf](http://www.niac.usra.edu/files/studies/final_report/pdf/752Marchese.pdf).

Knowing that highly qualified Examiners Langel and Kalafut were once again responsible for analyzing the published data was reassuring. There still remained, however, one nagging issue, namely, who had the ultimate authority to issue Applicant his patents. Counsel expressed concern that the pending applications were being examined in secret and that, without knowing who had that authority, Applicant was being unfairly denied an opportunity to present his case to the actual decision-maker.

Specialist McGinty then stated in no uncertain terms that Examiners Langel, Kalafut, and Wayner, the signers of the Office Actions under consideration, had "full authority" to examine the pending applications and to issue the patents.

Upon hearing that statement, counsel immediately turned to Examiner Langel and asked him point blank whether, after having studied the experimental evidence of record, he still believed that BlackLight's patent applications were allowable. The Examiner replied in no uncertain terms, "Yes, they're still allowable."

Counsel then asked Examiner Langel whether he was prepared to immediately allow the claims and issue Applicant his patents in those applications assigned to him, as is customary during an Interview, to which the Examiner replied, "Fine with me."

Specialist McGinty, however, expressed uneasiness over Examiner Langel's agreement to allow claims at the Interview. Specifically, he stated his concern that even if Applicant's claimed technology were found to be operable, there were still issues of novelty and nonobviousness to be addressed before a patent could be issued.

Counsel was surprised by that statement given the PTO's arguments over the prior three years that Applicant's inventions were inoperable based on an incorrect assumption that lower-energy hydrogen cannot possibly exist. Counsel pointed out the obvious contradiction in arguing that the Examiners may still need to conduct a prior art search for possible disclosure of Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology.

Counsel further noted the PTO's own examination guidelines requiring Examiners to evaluate the operability and utility of a claimed invention together with its novelty and nonobviousness following a complete prior art search. See MPEP § 706.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> MPEP § 706 provides in pertinent part:

Counsel again turned to Examiner Langel to confirm whether that was his understanding. The Examiner replied that it was and indicated that, in fact, the first thing he did was to conduct a thorough prior art search because he thought that might be the easiest way to dispose of the applications assigned to him. Examiner Langel explained, however, that he was unable to reject the applications on prior art grounds, which was why he originally allowed them.

Counsel acknowledged Specialist McGinty's hesitation to issue Applicant patents covering his claims at the Interview and assured him that Applicant wanted to work with him to remove any lingering concerns. Counsel then specifically asked Specialist McGinty to articulate how they might proceed in trying to accomplish that mutually beneficial goal. In response, Specialist McGinty indicated that, in the next Response to any pending or subsequent Office Actions, Applicant should focus on identifying the scientific data generated by independent third-party testing, as opposed to test data generated solely by Applicant. Counsel agreed to do that.

Specialist McGinty further expressed concern over whether that scientific data, even if assumed to be reliable, was commensurate with the scope of the claims of the various applications to adequately support patentability. Counsel stated that Applicant's data did adequately support the claimed subject matter. Counsel, however, recommended reviewing the claims of each application one by one with the assigned Examiners to see if at least some agreement could be reached as to those claims that are adequately supported and for which patents can be issued. As for any remaining claims that the Examiners believe are not adequately supported by the scientific data, Applicant would be free to seek such broader claim coverage through continued prosecution.

Specialist McGinty agreed that this was a reasonable way to proceed and granted a request by counsel, Mr. Simenauer, that this agreement be memorialized in

---

After the application has been read and the claimed invention understood, a prior art search for the claimed invention is made. With the results of the prior art search, including any references provided by the applicant, the patent application should be reviewed and analyzed in conjunction with the state of the prior art to determine whether the claims define a useful, novel, nonobvious, and enabled invention that has been clearly described in the specification. The goal of examination is to clearly articulate any rejection early in the prosecution process so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability and otherwise reply completely at the earliest opportunity.

writing in an attachment to the Interview Summary Form. Mr. Simenauer offered to draft this agreement, as is common practice, and Specialist McGinty enthusiastically accepted the offer. Mr. Simenauer then drafted the following Attachment as Specialist McGinty looked on:

**ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM**

Applicant requested that the following points discussed at the Interview held on February 11, 2003 be included as an Attachment to the Interview Summary Form.

Applicant's counsel and the Examiners in attendance at the Interview agreed to meet again at a future date, either in person or by telephone, to continue discussions regarding the patentability of Applicant's pending patent applications. Specifically, the Examiners expressed concern that Applicant's experimental evidence be commensurate with the scope of the claims. To address that concern, Applicant's counsel agreed with the Examiners to go through the patent applications claim-by-claim with the Examiners and demonstrate how the scientific data supports those claims.

For those claims that are supported by the data, the PTO agrees to issue those claims. For those claims that the PTO determines are not supported by the data, Applicant will continue to seek that broader claim coverage in subsequent proceedings. [Attachment F]

After completing the two-page handwritten Attachment, Mr. Simenauer read it out loud in the presence of Specialist McGinty and Examiner Langel so that they could confirm its accuracy and make any necessary changes. When asked by counsel whether they were satisfied with the wording of the Attachment, Specialist McGinty stated that he was, as did Examiner Langel, who then signed each of the two pages. There was absolutely no confusion as to the agreement to issue patents for those claims found to be supported by the scientific data.

Incredibly, in a transparent attempt to rewrite history, some unknown PTO official apparently instructed Examiner Langel to sign a subsequent communication mailed over two weeks later, on February 26, 2003, that included an attached "Supplement to Interview Summary" (Attachment F), which provides in pertinent part:



The following is a supplement to the summary concerning the February 11, 2003 interview re 09/501,622, etc. . . . A two-page Interview Summary was provided by Examiner Langel. A two page "Attachment to Interview Summary Form" also was provided by Mr. Simenauer. While the Attachment may represent the applicant's understanding of the interview, two points must be clarified.

First the second page of the applicant's attachment states in part: "for those claims that are supported by the data, the PTO agrees to issue those claims." The PTO made no such agreement. Instead, the PTO representatives indicated that the rejections under both 35 USC 101 and 112, 1<sup>st</sup> para., are outstanding and that evidence as to verification by credible, established, independent third parties would carry more persuasive weight.

Second, QAS Douglas McGinty was not listed in the Examiner's Interview Summary. He was present during the interview with the aforementioned attendees.

[signed] Wayne Langel  
Primary Examiner  
Art unit 1754

If PTO officials wanted to retract one of the key agreements reached at the Interview, they should have expressly said so, identifying who made the decision and giving reasons for the retraction. Since this was not done, Applicant has no choice but to rely on the accuracy of the contemporaneous written record.

Moreover, in view of other agreements reached at the Interview, the suggestion that there was no agreement to issue patents under the stated conditions is absurd—though hardly surprising given the sordid prosecution history of BlackLight's patent applications. Specialist McGinty plainly stated on the record that the Examiners who signed the outstanding rejections have full authority to review the data and to issue Applicant his patents. Also of record is Examiner Langel's unequivocal statement that, based on his review, he was prepared to issue those patents. To then force this same Examiner to sign a statement two weeks after the fact denying that "for those claims that are supported by the data, the PTO agrees to issue those claims" is, frankly, embarrassing.

Other ineffective arguments, such as those made by Examiner Kalafut that "the present Examiner did not commit to any agreements during the interview," are also disappointing and, hopefully, will not be repeated. [See Advisory Action dated April 2,

2003 filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,911.] Applicant acknowledges that, to the best of his recollection, Examiner Kalafut, although present at the February 11 Interview, did not speak a word. As previously indicated, it was Specialist McGinty who led the Interview on behalf of the PTO and it was he who ultimately agreed to the terms under which examination of BlackLight's patent applications would proceed, which terms were expressly reduced to writing. For Examiner Kalafut, or any other Examiner assigned to one of BlackLight's applications, to now attempt to distance themselves from that agreement based on the weak assertion that they did not personally commit to it during the Interview merely illustrates yet another example of the PTO's arbitrary and capricious approach to examining these applications.

**Applicant's Identification of Scientific Data Supporting Lower energy States of Hydrogen Generated and Furnished By Independent Third-Parties**

In light of the controversial prosecution history of this and other pending BlackLight cases, Applicant appreciated what seemed to be Specialist McGinty's willingness to set reasonable standards and guidelines by which Applicant's patents could finally be issued. Applicant acknowledged and documented Specialist McGinty's concern over the reliability of the record evidence, which led to his requirement that Applicant identify independent third-party verification of the scientific data as noted in the PTO's Supplement to Interview Summary. With those standards and guidelines in mind, Applicant presented in two pending applications a summary of the scientific data supporting lower energy states of hydrogen generated and furnished by independent third parties, which data is reproduced below along with additional, newly submitted data.<sup>124</sup>

**Experimental Evidence Generated by Independent Third Parties**

Applicant is unaware of any statutes, rules, or case law requiring that experimental evidence submitted by an Applicant in response to a rejection by the PTO be generated by independent third parties. Despite the higher standard imposed by

---

<sup>124</sup> See U.S. App'n Ser. Nos. 09/110,678 and 09/362,693.

Specialist McGinty requiring such third-party validation of the evidence, Applicant still has met and far exceeded this standard as shown below.

Applicant provides the following alphabetical list of independent third-party laboratories and universities that conducted the experiments and generated the scientific data relied upon and discussed in the analytical studies that follow this list:

Advanced Research - Pirelli Labs, Milan, Italy

Aero Propulsion and Power Directorate, Wright Laboratory, Air Force Material Command (ASC), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base

Atomic Energy Canada Limited, Chalk River Laboratories

Brookhaven National Laboratory

Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA

Charles Evans East, East Windsor, NJ

Environmental Catalysis and Materials Laboratory of Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Franklin and Marshall College

Galbraith Laboratories, Inc., Knoxville, TN

Grace Davison, Columbia, MD

IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY

Idaho National Engineering Laboratory

Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. (INP Greifswald, Germany)

Jobin Yvon Inc., Edison, NJ

Laboratory for Electrochemistry of Renewed Electrode-Solution Interface (LEPGER)

Liebert Corporation, Division of Emerson Corporation

Los Alamos National Laboratory

Material Testing Laboratory, Pennington, NJ

MIT Lincoln Laboratories

Moscow Power Engineering Institute

NASA Lewis

National Research Council of Canada

PacifiCorp

Pennsylvania State University Chemical Engineering Department

Perkin-Elmer Biosystems, Framingham, MA

Pirelli Labs, Milan, Italy

Ricerca, Inc., Painesville, Ohio

Rider University, Lawrenceville NJ

Rowan University Professors A. J. Marchese, P. M. Jansson, J. L. Schmalzel

Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany

Shrader Analytical & Consulting Laboratories

Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL

S. S. W., University of Western Ontario, Canada

Surface Science Laboratories, Mountain View, CA

Thermacore, Inc., Lancaster, PA

University of Delaware, Wilmington, DE

University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA

University of New Mexico

Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University,  
Bethlehem, PA

The following 51 abstracts briefly describe the analytical studies of the scientific data generated by these independent third parties (highlighted in underline).

## **Independent Test Results**

### **51. J. Phillips, C-K Chen, R. Mills, "Evidence of catalytic Production of Hot Hydrogen in RF Generated Hydrogen/Argon Plasmas", IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, submitted.**

J. Phillips, Distinguished National Laboratory Professor at Los Alamos National Laboratory and University of New Mexico, performed verification studies of line broadening in catalysis plasmas. This is the third in a series of papers by our team on apparently anomalous Balmer series line broadening in hydrogen containing RF generated, low pressure ( $< 600$  mTorr) plasmas. In this paper the selective broadening of the atomic hydrogen lines in pure H<sub>2</sub> and Ar/H<sub>2</sub> mixtures in a large "GEC" cell (36 cm length X 14 cm ID) was mapped as a function of position, H<sub>2</sub>/Ar ratio, time, power, and pressure. Several observations regarding the selective line broadening were particularly notable as they are unanticipated on the basis of earlier models. First, the anomalous broadening of the Balmer lines was found to exist throughout the plasma, and not just in the region between the electrodes. Second, the broadening was consistently a complex function of the operating parameters particularly gas composition (highest in pure H<sub>2</sub>) position, power and pressure. Clearly not anticipated by earlier models were the findings that under some conditions the highest concentration of "hot" ( $>10$  eV) hydrogen was found at the entry end, and not in the high field region between the electrodes and that in other conditions, the hottest H was at the (exit) pump (also grounded electrode) end. Third, excitation and electron temperatures were less than one eV in all regions of the plasma not directly adjacent ( $>1$ mm) to the electrodes, providing additional evidence that the energy for broadening, contrary to standard models, is not obtained from the field. Fourth, in contrast to our earlier studies of hydrogen/helium and water plasmas, we found that in some conditions 98% of the atomic hydrogen was in the "hot" state throughout the GEC cell. Virtually every operating parameter studied impacted the character of the hot H atom population, and

clearly second and third order effects exist, indicating a need for experimental design. Some non-field mechanisms for generating hot hydrogen atoms, specifically those suggested by Mills' CQM model, are outlined.

**50. J. Phillips, C. K. Chen, R. Mills, "Evidence of the Production of Hot Hydrogen Atoms in RF Plasmas by Catalytic Reactions Between Hydrogen and Oxygen Species", Journal Plasma Physics, submitted.**

J. Phillips, Distinguished National Laboratory Professor at Los Alamos National Laboratory and University of New Mexico, performed verification studies of line broadening in catalysis plasmas. Selective H-atom line broadening was found to be present throughout the volume (13.5 cm ID x 38 cm length) of RF generated  $H_2O$  plasmas in a GEC cell. Notably, at low pressures (ca. <0.08 Torr), a significant fraction (ca. 20%) of the atomic hydrogen was 'hot' with energies greater than 40 eV with a pressure dependence, but only a weak power dependence. The degree of broadening was virtually independent of the position studied within the GEC cell, similar to the recent finding for  $He/H_2$  plasmas in the same GEC cell. In contrast to the atomic hydrogen lines, no broadening was observed in oxygen species lines at low pressures. Also, in 'control'  $Xe/H_2$  plasmas run in the same cell at similar pressures and adsorbed power, no significant broadening of atomic hydrogen,  $Xe$ , or any other lines was observed. Stark broadening or acceleration of charged species due to high electric fields can not explain the results since i) the electron density was insufficient by orders of magnitude, ii) the RF field was essentially confined to the cathode fall region in contrast to the broadening that was independent of position, and iii) only the atomic hydrogen lines were broadened. Rather, all of the data is consistent with a model that claims specific, predicted, species can act catalytically through a resonant energy transfer mechanism to create 'hot' hydrogen atoms in plasmas.

**49. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, B. Dhandapani, "Spectral Identification of  $H_2(1/2)$ ", submitted.**

Lower-energy molecular hydrogen lines were independently recorded and interpreted by Stephan Fuelling of the University of Nevada, Reno and the Nevada Terawatt Facility and provided to BlackLight. Novel emission lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, \text{ or } 11$  were previously observed by extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy recorded on microwave discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen [R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. Phys. D, Applied Physics, Vol. 36, (2003), pp. 1535-1542]. These lines matched  $H(1/p)$ , fractional Rydberg states of atomic hydrogen wherein  $n = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots, \frac{1}{p}$ ; ( $p \leq 137$  is an integer) replaces the well known parameter  $n = \text{integer}$  in the Rydberg equation for hydrogen excited states. Evidence supports that these states are formed by a resonant nonradiative energy transfer to  $He^+$  acting as a catalyst; whereas, krypton, xenon, and their ions serve as controls. Two  $H(1/2)$  may react to form  $H_2(1/2)$  with emission of the bond energy from a resonant state within its transition state with vibration-rotational energies that are the same as those of  $H_2$ . A series of vibration-rotational bands in the 60-67 nm region, a high-energy region for which vibration-rotational spectra are ordinarily unknown, was observed from low-pressure helium-hydrogen (99/1%) microwave plasmas that matched the predicted energy spacing of the vibrational energy of  $H_2$  about the bond energy of  $H_2(1/2)$  corresponding to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$ .

**48. J. Phillips, C. K. Chen, T. Shiina, "Evidence of Catalytic Production of Hot Atomic Hydrogen in RF Hydrogen/Helium Generated Plasmas", IEEE Transactions Plasma Science, submitted.**

A study of the line shapes of hydrogen Balmer series lines in RF generated low pressure  $H_2/He$  plasmas performed at the University of New Mexico, Department of Chemical and Nuclear Engineering produced results suggesting a catalytic process between helium and hydrogen species results in the generation of 'hot' (ca. 28 eV) atomic hydrogen. Even far from the electrodes (ca. 15 cm) both 'cold' (<2.5 eV) and 'hot' atomic hydrogen were found in  $H_2/He$  plasmas. Line shapes, relative line areas of cold and hot atomic hydrogen (hot/cold>2.5), were very similar for areas between the

electrodes and far from the electrodes for these plasmas. In contrast, in  $H_2/Xe$  only 'warm' (<5 eV) hydrogen (warm/cold<1.0) was found between the electrodes, and only cold hydrogen away from the electrodes. Earlier postulates that preferential hydrogen line broadening in plasmas results from the acceleration of ionic hydrogen in the vicinity of electrodes, and the special charge exchange characteristics of  $Ar/H_2^+$  are clearly belied by the present results that show atomic hydrogen line shape are similar for  $H_2/He$  plasmas throughout the relatively large cylindrical (14 cm ID x 36 cm length) cavity.

**47. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, J. He, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, Luca Gamberale, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Central European Journal of Physics, submitted.**

Luca Gamberale of the Advanced Research - Pirelli Labs, Milan, Italy performed verification studies as a visiting researcher at BlackLight Power, Cranbury, NJ. The prior reported results of BlackLight Power, Inc. of a chemically generated hydrogen plasma, extraordinarily broadened atomic hydrogen lines, lower-energy hydrogen molecular-ion lines, the isolation and characterization of lower-energy molecular hydrogen gas, and excess power measured by water bath calorimetry were replicated. Specifically, plasmas of certain catalysts such as  $Sr^+$ ,  $Ar^+$ , and  $He^+$  mixed with hydrogen were studied for evidence of a novel energetic reaction. A hydrogen plasma was observed to form at low temperatures (e.g.  $\approx 10^3 K$ ) and an extraordinary low field strength of about 1-2 V/cm when argon and strontium were present with atomic hydrogen. RF and microwave plasmas were used to generate  $He^+$  and  $Ar^+$  catalysts. Extraordinarily fast H (40-50 eV) was observed by Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening only from plasmas having a catalyst with H. Novel emission lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 eV$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, \text{ or } 11$  were previously observed by extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy recorded on microwave discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen [R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. Phys. D, Applied Physics, Vol. 36, (2003), pp. 1535-1542]. These lines matched  $H(1/p)$ , fractional Rydberg states of atomic hydrogen wherein

$n = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots, \frac{1}{p}$ ; ( $p \leq 137$  is an integer) replaces the well known parameter  $n = \text{integer}$  in



the Rydberg equation for hydrogen excited states.  $H(1/p)$  may react with a proton and two  $H(1/p)$  may react to form  $H_2(1/p)^+$  and  $H_2(1/p)$ , respectively, that have vibrational and rotational energies that are  $p^2$  times those of the species comprising uncatalyzed atomic hydrogen. A series of over twenty peaks in the 10-65 nm region emitted from low-pressure helium-hydrogen (90/10%) and argon-hydrogen (90/10%) microwave plasmas matched the energy spacing of  $2^2$  times the transition-state vibrational energy of  $H_2^+$  with the series ending on the bond energy of  $H_2(1/4)^+$ .  $H_2(1/p)$  gas was isolated by liquefaction using an high-vacuum ( $10^{-6}$  Torr) capable, liquid nitrogen cryotrap and was characterized by gas chromatography (GC), mass spectroscopy (MS), visible and EUV optical emission spectroscopy (OES), and  $^1H$  NMR of the condensable gas dissolved in  $CDCl_3$ . Novel peaks were observed by cryogenic gas chromatography performed on the condensable gas which was highly pure hydrogen by MS and had a higher ionization energy than  $H_2$ . The observation that the EUV emission spectrum changed with deuterium substitution in a region where no hydrogen emission has ever been observed further supported the existence of lower-energy molecular hydrogen. Contaminants and exotic helium-hydrogen species were eliminated as the source of the reaction and condensed gas plasma emission spectra. Upfield shifted NMR peaks were observed at 3.47 ppm and 2.18 ppm compared to that of  $H_2$  at 4.63 ppm that matched  $H_2(1/2)$  and  $H_2(1/4)$ , respectively. Excess power was absolutely measured from the helium-hydrogen plasma. For an input of 44.3 W, the total plasma power of the helium-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry was 62.9 W corresponding to 18.6 W of excess power in  $3\text{ cm}^3$ . The excess power density and energy balance were high,  $6.2\text{ W/cm}^3$  and  $-5 \times 10^4\text{ kJ/mole } H_2$  ( $240\text{ eV/H atom}$ ), respectively.

46. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, J. He, M. Nansteel, P. Ray, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Spectral Identification of New States of Hydrogen", *New Journal of Chemistry*, submitted.

Novel emission lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6\text{ eV}$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11$  were previously observed by extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy recorded on microwave

discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen [R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. Phys. D, Applied Physics, Vol. 36, (2003), pp. 1535-1542]. These lines matched  $H(1/p)$ , fractional Rydberg states of atomic hydrogen wherein  $n = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots, \frac{1}{p}$ ; ( $p \leq 137$  is an integer) replaces the well known parameter  $n = \text{integer}$  in the Rydberg equation for hydrogen excited states. Evidence supports that these states are formed by a resonant nonradiative energy transfer to  $He^+$  acting as a catalyst.  $Ar^+$  also serves as a catalyst to form  $H(1/p)$ ; whereas, krypton, xenon, and their ions serve as controls.  $H(1/p)$  may react with a proton and two  $H(1/p)$  may react to form  $H_2(1/p)^+$  and  $H_2(1/p)$ , respectively, that have vibrational and rotational energies that are  $p^2$  times those of the species comprising uncatalyzed atomic hydrogen. A series of over twenty peaks in the 10-65 nm region emitted from low-pressure helium-hydrogen (90/10%) and argon-hydrogen (90/10%) microwave plasmas matched the energy spacing of  $2^2$  times the transition-state vibrational energy of  $H_2^+$  with the series ending on the bond energy of  $H_2(1/4)^+$ . Rotational lines were observed in the 145-300 nm region from atmospheric pressure electron-beam excited argon-hydrogen plasmas. The unprecedented energy spacing of  $4^2$  times that of hydrogen established the internuclear distance as  $1/4$  that of  $H_2$  and identified  $H_2(1/4)$ . The results were independently recorded at Rutgers University.  $H_2(1/p)$  gas was isolated by liquefaction at liquid nitrogen temperature and by decomposition of compounds found to contain the corresponding hydride ions  $H^-(1/p)$ . The  $H_2(1/p)$  gas was dissolved in  $CDCl_3$  and characterized by  $^1H$  NMR at Rider University, Lawrenceville NJ. Considering solvent effects, singlet peaks upfield of  $H_2$  were observed with a predicted integer spacing of 0.64 ppm at 3.47, 3.02, 2.18, 1.25, 0.85, and 0.22 ppm which matched the consecutive series  $H_2(1/2)$ ,  $H_2(1/3)$ ,  $H_2(1/4)$ ,  $H_2(1/5)$ ,  $H_2(1/6)$ , and  $H_2(1/7)$ , respectively. Excess power was absolutely measured from the helium-hydrogen plasma. For an input of 41.9 W, the total plasma power of the helium-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry was 62.1 W corresponding to 20.2 W of excess power in  $3 \text{ cm}^3$  plasma volume. The excess power density and energy balance were high,  $6.7 \text{ W/cm}^3$  and  $-5.4 \times 10^4 \text{ kJ/mole } H_2$

( $280 \text{ eV} / H \text{ atom}$ ), respectively. In addition to power applications, battery and propellant reactions are proposed that may be transformational, and observed excited vibration-rotational levels of  $H_2(1/4)$  could be the basis of a UV laser that could significantly advance photolithography.

**45. Dr. K.D. Keefer, Report on BlackLight Power Technology: Its Apparent Scientific Basis, State of Development and Stability for Commercialization by Liebert Corporation, (2001), and, Report on BlackLight Power Technology: Its Apparent Scientific Basis, State of Development and Stability for Commercialization, (2002).**

To separate reports disclosing the results of NMR, ToF-SIMS, XPS identification of novel hydrino hydride compounds and analysis of chemically-produced plasma by an expert hired by the Liebert Corporation, a division of the well-known and highly-respected Emerson Corporation. According to the expert's own words, he "observed demonstrations of the BlackLight Power (BLP) process and ...reached the inescapable conclusion that it is based on extraordinary chemical reactions that seem to release extraordinary amounts of energy.... It is [his] professional opinion that the BLP process represents a chemical conversion of atomic hydrogen unlike any previously reported [in] the archival scientific literature." Although the expert states that he was skeptical of Applicant's theory, he admitted that the chemical and plasma data did support Applicant's fractional quantum states and that he could offer no other explanation of the data using conventional quantum theory.

**44. A. J. Marchese, P. M. Jansson, J. L. Schmalzel, "The BlackLight Rocket Engine", Phase I Final Report, NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts Phase I, May 1-November 30, 2002,  
[http://www.niac.usra.edu/files/studies/final\\_report/pdf/752Marchese.pdf](http://www.niac.usra.edu/files/studies/final_report/pdf/752Marchese.pdf).**

Rowan University Professors A. J. Marchese, P. M. Jansson, J. L. Schmalzel performed verification studies as visiting researchers at BlackLight Power, Cranbury, NJ. The prior reported results of BlackLight Power, Inc. of extraordinarily broadened atomic hydrogen lines, population inversion, lower-energy hydrogen lines, and excess

power measured by water bath calorimetry were replicated. The application of the energetic hydrogen to propulsion was studied.

Specifically, the data supporting hydrinos was replicated. See

i.) BlackLight Process Theory (pp. 10-12) which gives the theoretical energy levels for hydrinos and the catalytic reaction to form hydrinos,

ii.) Unique Hydrogen Line Broadening in Low Pressure Microwave Water Plasmas (pp. 25-27, particularly Fig. 21) which shows that in the same microwave cavity driven at the same power, the temperature of the hydrogen atoms in the microwave plasma where the hydrino reaction was active was 50 times that of the control based on the spectroscopic line widths,

iii.) Inversion of the Line Intensities in Hydrogen Balmer Series (pp. 27-28, particularly Fig. 22) which shows for the first time in 40 years of intensive worldwide research that atomic hydrogen population inversion was achieved in a steady state plasma and supports the high power released from the reaction of hydrogen to form hydrinos,

iv.) Novel Vacuum Ultraviolet (VUV) Vibration Spectra of Hydrogen Mixture Plasmas (pp. 28-29, particularly Fig. 23) which shows a novel vibrational series of lines in a helium-hydrogen plasmas at energies higher than any known vibrational series and it identically matches the theoretical prediction of 2 squared times the corresponding vibration of the ordinary hydrogen species, and

v.) Water Bath Calorimetry Experiments Showing Increased Heat Generation (pp. 29-30, particularly Fig. 25) that shows that with exactly the same system and same input power, the heating of the water reservoir absolutely measured to 1% accuracy was equivalent to 55 to 62 W with the catalyst-hydrogen mixture compared to 40 W in the control without the possibility of the reaction to form hydrinos.

**43. J. Phillips, R. L. Mills, X. Chen, "Water Bath Calorimetric Study of Excess Heat in 'Resonance Transfer' Plasmas", Journal of Applied Physics, Vol. 96, No. 6, pp. 3095-3102.**

J. Phillips, Distinguished National Laboratory Professor at Los Alamos National Laboratory and University of New Mexico, performed verification studies as a visiting

researcher at BlackLight Power, Cranbury, NJ. Water bath calorimetry was used to demonstrate one more peculiar phenomenon associated with a certain class of mixed gas plasmas termed resonant transfer, or rt-plasmas. Specifically,  $He/H_2(10\%)$  (500 mTorr),  $Ar/H_2(10\%)$  (500 mTorr), and  $H_2O(g)$  (500 mTorr and 200 mTorr) plasmas generated with an Evenson microwave cavity consistently yielded on the order of 50% more heat than non rt-plasma (controls) such as  $He$ ,  $Kr$ ,  $Kr/H_2(10\%)$ , under identical conditions of gas flow, pressure, and microwave operating conditions. The excess power density of rt-plasmas was of the order  $10\text{ W}\cdot\text{cm}^{-3}$ . In earlier studies with these same rt-plasmas it was demonstrated that other unusual features were present including dramatic broadening of the hydrogen Balmer series lines, unique vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) lines, and in the case of water plasmas, population inversion of the hydrogen excited states. Both the current results and the earlier results are completely consistent with the existence of a hitherto unknown exothermic chemical reaction, such as that predicted by Mills, occurring in rt-plasmas.

42. R. L. Mills, P. C. Ray, R. M. Mayo, M. Nansteel, B. Dhandapani, J. Phillips, "Spectroscopic Study of Unique Line Broadening and Inversion in Low Pressure Microwave Generated Water Plasmas", J. Plasma Phys. Vol. 71, (2005), pp. 877-88.

J. Phillips, Distinguished National Laboratory Professor at Los Alamos National Laboratory and University of New Mexico, performed verification studies as a visiting researcher at BlackLight Power, Cranbury, NJ. It was demonstrated that low pressure ( $\sim 0.2$  Torr) water vapor plasmas generated in a 10 mm ID quartz tube with an Evenson microwave cavity show at least two features which are not explained by conventional plasma models. First, significant ( $> 2.5\text{ \AA}$ ) hydrogen Balmer  $\alpha$  line broadening was recorded, of constant width, up to 5 cm from the microwave coupler. Only hydrogen, and not oxygen, showed significant line broadening. This feature, observed previously in hydrogen-containing mixed gas plasmas generated with high voltage DC and RF discharges was explained by some researchers to result from acceleration of hydrogen ions near the cathode. This explanation cannot apply to the line broadening observed

in the (electrodeless) microwave plasmas generated in this work, particularly at distances as great as 5 cm from the microwave coupler. Second, dramatic inversion of the line intensities of both the Lyman and Balmer series, again, at distances up to 5 cm from the coupler were observed. The dramatic line inversion suggests the existence of a hitherto unknown source of pumping of the optical power in plasmas. Finally, it is notable that other aspects of the plasma including the  $OH^*$  rotational temperature and low electron concentrations are quite typical of plasmas of this type.

**41. H. Conrads, R. Mills, Th. Wrubel, "Emission in the Deep Vacuum Ultraviolet from a Plasma Formed by Incandescently Heating Hydrogen Gas with Trace Amounts of Potassium Carbonate", Plasma Sources Science and Technology, Vol. 12, (2003), pp. 389-395.**

The generation of a hydrogen plasma with intense extreme ultraviolet and visible emission was observed at Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany from low pressure hydrogen gas (0.1-1 mbar) in contact with a hot tungsten filament only when the filament heated a titanium dissociator coated with  $K_2CO_3$  above 750°C. The dissociator was electrically floated, and the electric field strength from the filament was about 1 V/cm, two orders of magnitude lower than the starting voltages measured for gas glow discharges. The emission of the  $H_\alpha$  and  $H_\beta$  transitions as well as the  $L_\alpha$  and  $L_\beta$  transitions were recorded and analyzed. The plasma seemed to be far from thermal equilibrium, and no conventional mechanism was found to explain the formation of a hydrogen plasma by incandescently heating hydrogen gas with the presence of trace amounts of  $K_2CO_3$ . The temporal behavior of the plasma was recorded via hydrogen Balmer alpha line emission when all power into the cell was terminated. A two second decay of the plasma was observed after a fast decay of the electric field to zero. The plasma was found to be dependent on the chemistry of atomic hydrogen with potassium since no plasma formed with  $Na_2CO_3$  replacing  $K_2CO_3$  and the time constant of the emission following the removal of all of the power to the cell matched that of the cooling of the filament and the resulting shift from atomic to molecular hydrogen. Our results

indicate that a novel chemical power source is present that forms the energetic hydrogen plasma. The plasma is a potential new light source.

**40. R. Mills, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Emission from Hydrogen-KI Plasmas Produced by a Hollow Cathode Discharge", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 6, (2001), pp. 579-592.**

A high voltage discharge of hydrogen with and without the presence of a source of potassium, potassium iodide, in the discharge was performed at Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. (INP Greifswald, Germany) with a hollow cathode. It has been reported that intense extreme ultraviolet (EUV) emission was observed at low temperatures (e.g.  $< 10^3$  K) from atomic hydrogen and certain atomized elements or certain gaseous ions which ionize at integer multiples of the potential energy of atomic hydrogen,  $27.2$  eV [1, 3-5]. Two potassium ions or a potassium atom may each provide an electron ionization or transfer reaction that has a net enthalpy equal to an integer multiple of  $27.2$  eV. The spectral lines of atomic hydrogen were intense enough to be recorded on photographic films only when KI was present. EUV lines not assignable to potassium, iodine, or hydrogen were observed at 73.0, 132.6, 513.6, 677.8, 885.9, and 1032.9 Å. The lines are assigned to transitions of atomic hydrogen to lower energy levels corresponding to lower energy hydrogen atoms called hydrino atoms and the emission from the excitation of the corresponding hydride ions formed from the hydrino atoms.

**39. R. Mills, "Temporal Behavior of Light-Emission in the Visible Spectral Range from a Ti-K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>-H-Cell", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 4, (2001), pp. 327-332.**

Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. (INP Greifswald, Germany)

reports the generation of a hydrogen plasma and extreme ultraviolet emission as recorded via the hydrogen Balmer emission in the visible range. Typically a hydrogen plasma is generated and the emission of extreme ultraviolet light from hydrogen gas is achieved via a discharge at high voltage, a high power inductively coupled plasma, or a

plasma created and heated to extreme temperatures by RF coupling (e.g.  $> 10^6$  K) with confinement provided by a toroidal magnetic field. The observed plasma formed at low temperatures (e.g.  $\approx 10^3$  K) from atomic hydrogen generated at a tungsten filament that heated a titanium dissociator coated with potassium carbonate. The temporal behavior of the plasma was recorded via hydrogen Balmer alpha line emission when all power into the cell was terminated. A two second decay of the plasma was observed after a fast decay of the electric field to zero. The persistence of emission following the removal of all of the power to the cell indicates that a novel chemical power source is present that forms an energetic plasma in hydrogen. No unusual behavior was observed with the control sodium carbonate.

**38. R. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, "Synthesis and Characterization of Diamond Films from MPCVD of an Energetic Argon-Hydrogen Plasma and Methane", Materials Science, submitted.**

Polycrystalline diamond films were synthesized on silicon substrates by a low power ( $\sim 80$  W) microwave plasma chemical vapor deposition (MPCVD) reaction of a mixture of argon-hydrogen-methane (17.5/80/2.5%). The films were characterized by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS), X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), Raman spectroscopy (Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) (S. S. W., University of Western Ontario, Canada), and X-ray diffraction (XRD) (IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY). It is proposed that  $Ar^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma.  $CH$ ,  $C_2$ , and  $C_3$  emissions were observed with significantly broadened H  $\alpha$  line. The average hydrogen atom temperature of a argon-hydrogen-methane plasma was measured to be 110 - 130 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen. Bombardment of the carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of diamond. Then, by this novel pathway, the relevance of the CO tie line is eliminated along with other stringent conditions and complicated and



inefficient techniques which limit broad application of the versatility and superiority of diamond thin film technology.

**37. R. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, P. Jansson, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Spectroscopic and NMR Identification of Novel Hydride Ions in Fractional Quantum Energy States Formed by an Exothermic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen with Certain Catalysts", European Physics Journal: Applied Physics, Vol. 28, (2004), pp. 83-104.**

$2K^+$  to  $K + K^{2+}$  and  $K$  to  $K^{3+}$  provide a reaction with a net enthalpy equal to the one and three times the potential energy of atomic hydrogen, respectively. The presence of these gaseous ions or atoms with thermally dissociated hydrogen formed a so-called resonance transfer (rt) plasma having strong VUV emission with a stationary inverted Lyman population. Significant line broadening of the Balmer  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  lines of 18 eV was observed, compared to 3 eV from a hydrogen microwave plasma. Emission from rt-plasmas occurred even when the electric field applied to the plasma was zero as recorded at Institut für Niedertemperatur-Plasmaphysik e.V. (INP Greifswald, Germany). The reaction was exothermic since excess power of  $20 \text{ mW} \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$  was measured by Calvet calorimetry. An energetic catalytic reaction was proposed involving a resonant energy transfer between hydrogen atoms and  $2K^+$  or  $K$  to form very stable novel hydride ions  $H^-(1/p)$  called hydrino hydrides having a fractional principal quantum numbers  $p = 2$  and  $p = 4$ , respectively. Characteristic emission was observed from  $K^{2+}$  and  $K^{3+}$  that confirmed the resonant nonradiative energy transfer of  $27.2 \text{ eV}$  and  $3 \cdot 27.2 \text{ eV}$  from atomic hydrogen to  $2K^+$  and  $K$ , respectively.

The predicted binding energy of  $H^-(1/2)$  of  $3.0471 \text{ eV}$  with the fine structure was observed at  $4071 \text{ Å}$ , and its predicted bound-free hyperfine structure lines  $E_{\text{HF}} = j^2 3.00213 \times 10^{-5} + 3.0563 \text{ eV}$  ( $j$  is an integer) matched those observed for  $j = 1$  to  $j = 37$  to within a 1 part per  $10^4$ .  $H^-(1/4)$  was observed spectroscopically at  $110 \text{ nm}$  corresponding to its predicted binding energy of  $11.2 \text{ eV}$ . The  $^1\text{H}$  MAS NMR spectrum (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL) of novel compound  $KH^*Cl$  relative to

external tetramethylsilane (TMS) showed a large distinct upfield resonance at -4.4 corresponding to an absolute resonance shift of -35.9 ppm that matched the theoretical prediction of  $p = 4$ . A novel NMR (Grace Davison, Columbia, MD and Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL) peak of  $KH^*I$  at -1.5 ppm relative to TMS corresponding to an absolute resonance shift of -33.0 ppm matched the theoretical prediction of  $p = 2$ . The predicted catalyst reactions, position of the upfield-shifted NMR peaks, and spectroscopic data for  $H^-(1/2)$  and  $H^-(1/4)$  were found to be in agreement.

**36. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Novel Liquid-Nitrogen-Condensable Molecular Hydrogen Gas", Acta Physica Polonica A, submitted.**

Extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy was recorded on microwave discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen. Novel emission lines were observed with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11$  or these discrete energies less  $21.2 \text{ eV}$  corresponding to inelastic scattering of these photons by helium atoms due to excitation of  $He(1s^2)$  to  $He(1s^1 2p^1)$ . These lines matched  $H(1/p)$ , fractional Rydberg states of atomic hydrogen, formed by a resonant nonradiative energy transfer to  $He^+$ . Corresponding emission due to the reaction  $2H(1/2) \rightarrow H_2(1/2)$  with vibronic coupling at  $E_{D+vib} = p^2 E_{D H_2} \pm \left(\frac{\nu^*}{3}\right) E_{vib H_2(\nu=0 \rightarrow \nu=1)}$ ,  $\nu^* = 1, 2, 3 \dots$  was observed at the longer wavelengths for  $\nu^* = 2$  to  $\nu^* = 32$  and at the shorter wavelengths for  $\nu^* = 1$  to  $\nu^* = 16$  where  $E_{D H_2}$  and  $E_{vib H_2(\nu=0 \rightarrow \nu=1)}$  are the experimental bond and vibrational energies of  $H_2$ , respectively. Fractional-principal-quantum-level molecular hydrogen  $H_2(1/p)$  gas was isolated by liquefaction using an ultrahigh-vacuum, liquid nitrogen cryotrap and was characterized by gas chromatography (GC), mass spectroscopy (MS), optical emission spectroscopy (OES), and  $^1H$  NMR (Rider University, Lawrenceville NJ) of the condensable gas dissolved in  $CDCl_3$ . The condensable gas was highly pure hydrogen by GC and MS and had a higher ionization energy than  $H_2$ . An upfield shifted NMR peaks were observed at 3.47 and 2.18 ppm compared to that of  $H_2$  at 4.63 ppm. A theoretical rocketry propellant reaction is given that may be transformational.

**35. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Spectroscopic Characterization of the Atomic Hydrogen Energies and Densities and Carbon Species During Helium-Hydrogen-Methane Plasma CVD Synthesis of Single Crystal Diamond Films", Chemistry of Materials, Vol. 15, (2003), pp. 1313-1321.**

Polycrystalline diamond films were synthesized on silicon substrates for the first time without diamond seeding by a very low power (38 W) microwave plasma continuous vapor deposition (MPCVD) reaction of a mixture of helium-hydrogen-methane (48.2/48.2/3.6%). The films were characterized by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS), X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), Raman spectroscopy (Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA and Jobin Yvon Inc., Edison, NJ), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) (S. S. W., University of Western Ontario, Canada and Material Testing Laboratory, Pennington, NJ), and X-ray diffraction (XRD) (IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY). It is proposed that  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma.  $CH$ ,  $C_2$ , and  $C_3$  emissions were observed with significantly broadened  $H \alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$  lines. The average hydrogen atom temperature of a helium-hydrogen-methane plasma was measured to be 120 - 140 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen. Bombardment of the carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of diamond. Then, by this novel pathway, the relevance of the CO tie line is eliminated along with other stringent conditions and complicated and inefficient techniques which limit broad application of the versatility and superiority of diamond thin film technology.

**34. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Low Power MPCVD of Diamond Films on Silicon Substrates", Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A, submitted.**

Polycrystalline diamond films were synthesized on silicon substrates for the first time without diamond seeding by a very low power (38 W) microwave plasma

continuous vapor deposition (MPCVD) reaction of a mixture of 10-30% hydrogen, 90-70% helium, and 1-10%  $CH_4$ . The films were characterized by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS), X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), Raman spectroscopy (Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) (S. S. W., University of Western Ontario, Canada and Material Testing Laboratory, Pennington, NJ), and X-ray diffraction (XRD) (IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY). It is proposed that  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma. The average hydrogen atom temperature was measured to be 180-210 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen. The electron temperature  $T_e$  for helium-hydrogen was 28,000 K compared to 6800 K for pure helium. Bombardment of the carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of diamond. Then, by this novel pathway, the relevance of the CO tie line is eliminated along with other stringent conditions and complicated and inefficient techniques which limit broad application of the versatility and superiority of diamond thin film technology.

**33. R. L. Mills, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Synthesis and Spectroscopic Identification of Lithium Chloro Hydride", Materials Characterization, submitted.**

A novel inorganic hydride compound, lithium chloro hydride ( $LiHCl$ ), which comprises a high binding energy hydride ion was synthesized by reaction of atomic hydrogen with potassium metal and lithium chloride. Lithium chloro hydride was identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA),  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL), and powder X-ray diffraction (IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY). Hydride ions with increased binding energies may form many novel compounds with broad applications such as the oxidant of a high voltage battery.

**32. R. L. Mills, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Highly Stable Amorphous Silicon Hydride",  
Solar Energy Materials & Solar Cells, Vol. 80, No. 1, (2003), pp. 1-20.**

A novel highly stable hydrogen terminated silicon coating was synthesized by microwave plasma reaction of mixture of silane, hydrogen, and helium wherein it is proposed that  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form highly stable silicon hydrides. Novel silicon hydride was identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy. The time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS) identified the coatings as hydride by the large  $SiH^+$  peak in the positive spectrum and the dominant  $H^-$  in the negative spectrum. Since hydrogen is the only element with no primary element peaks, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA) identified the  $H$  content of the  $SiH$  coatings as comprising novel silicon hydrides due to new peaks at 11, 43, and 55 eV in the absence of corresponding peaks of any candidate element at higher binding energies. The silicon hydride surface was remarkably stable to air as shown by XPS. The highly stable amorphous silicon hydride coating may advance the production of integrated circuits and microdevices by resisting the oxygen passivation of the surface and possibly altering the dielectric constant and band gap to increase device performance.

**31. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Synthesis of HDLC  
Films from Solid Carbon", J. of Material Science, Vol. 39 (2004), pp. 3309-18.**

Diamond-like carbon (DLC) films were synthesized on silicon substrates from solid carbon by a very low power (~60 W) microwave plasma chemical vapor deposition (MPCVD) reaction of a mixture of 90-70% helium and 10-30% hydrogen. It is proposed that  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form an energetic plasma. The average hydrogen atom temperature of a helium-hydrogen plasma was measured to be 180-210 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen. Bombardment of the carbon surface by highly energetic hydrogen formed by the catalysis reaction may play a role in the formation of DLC. The films were characterized by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS), X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), and Raman

spectroscopy (Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA). TOF-SIMS identified the coatings as hydride by the large  $H^+$  peak in the positive spectrum and the dominant  $H^-$  in the negative spectrum. The XPS identification of the  $H$  content of the  $CH$  coatings as a novel hydride corresponding to a peak at 49 eV has implications that the mechanism of the DLC formation may also involve one or both of selective etching of graphitic carbon and the stabilization of  $sp^3$ -bonded carbon by the hydrogen catalysis product. Thus, a novel  $H$  intermediate formed by the plasma catalysis reaction may enhance the stabilization and etching role of  $H$  used in past methods.

**30. R. L. Mills, J. He, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, X. Chen, "Synthesis and Characterization of a Highly Stable Amorphous Silicon Hydride as the Product of a Catalytic Helium-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, in press.**

A novel highly stable surface coating  $SiH(1/p)$  which comprised high binding energy hydride ions was synthesized by a microwave plasma reaction of a mixture of silane, hydrogen, and helium wherein it is proposed that  $He^+$  served as a catalyst with atomic hydrogen to form the highly stable hydride ions. Novel silicon hydride was identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy. The time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS) identified the coatings as hydride by the large  $SiH^+$  peak in the positive spectrum and the dominant  $H^-$  in the negative spectrum. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA) identified the  $H$  content of the  $SiH$  coatings as hydride ions,  $H^-(1/4)$ ,  $H^-(1/9)$ , and  $H^-(1/11)$  corresponding to peaks at 11, 43, and 55 eV, respectively. The silicon hydride surface was remarkably stable to air as shown by XPS. The highly stable amorphous silicon hydride coating may advance the production of integrated circuits and microdevices by resisting the oxygen passivation of the surface and possibly altering the dielectric constant and band gap to increase device performance.

The plasma which formed  $SiH(1/p)$  showed a number of extraordinary features. Novel emission lines with energies of  $q \cdot 13.6 \text{ eV}$  where  $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, \text{ or } 11$  were

previously observed by extreme ultraviolet (EUV) spectroscopy recorded on microwave discharges of helium with 2% hydrogen [R. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectral Emission of Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Atomic Hydrogen from a Helium-Hydrogen Plasma and the Implications for Dark Matter", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 301-322]. These lines matched  $H(1/p)$ , fractional Rydberg states of atomic hydrogen where  $p$  is an integer, formed by a resonant nonradiative energy transfer to  $He^+$  acting as a catalyst. The average hydrogen atom temperature of the helium-hydrogen plasma was measured to be 180-210 eV versus  $\approx 3$  eV for pure hydrogen. Using water bath calorimetry, excess power was observed from the helium-hydrogen plasma compared to control krypton plasma. For example, for an input of 8.1 W, the total plasma power of the helium-hydrogen plasma measured by water bath calorimetry was 30.0 W corresponding to 21.9 W of excess power in  $3\text{ cm}^3$ . The excess power density and energy balance were high,  $7.3\text{ W/cm}^3$  and  $-2.9 \times 10^4\text{ kJ/mole H}_2$ , respectively. This catalytic plasma reaction may represent a new hydrogen energy source and a new field of hydrogen chemistry.

**29. R. L. Mills, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Synthesis and Characterization of Lithium Chloro Hydride", Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, submitted.**

A novel inorganic hydride compound lithium chloro hydride,  $LiHCl$ , which comprises a high binding energy hydride ion was synthesized by reaction of atomic hydrogen with potassium metal and lithium chloride. Lithium chloro hydride was identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA),  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL), and powder X-ray diffraction (IC Laboratories, Amawalk, NY). Hydride ions with increased binding energies may form many novel compounds with broad applications such as the oxidant of a high voltage battery.

**28. R. Mills, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Highly Stable Novel Inorganic Hydrides from Aqueous Electrolysis and Plasma Electrolysis", *Electrochimica Acta*, Vol. 47, No. 24, (2002), pp. 3909-3926.**

After  $10^4$  hours of continuous aqueous electrolysis with  $K_2CO_3$  as the electrolyte, highly stable novel inorganic hydride compounds such as  $KHKHCO_3$  and  $KH$  were isolated and identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS) (Charles Evans East, East Windsor, NJ). The existence of novel hydride ions was determined using X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA) and solid state magic-angle spinning  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy ( $^1H$  MAS NMR) (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL). A novel ion formed by plasma electrolysis of a  $K_2CO_3$ ,  $Rb_2CO_3$ , or  $Cs_2CO_3$  electrolyte was also observed by high resolution visible spectroscopy at 407.0 nm corresponding to its predicted binding energy of 3.05 eV.

**27. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Identification of Compounds Containing Novel Hydride Ions by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 9, Sept. (2001), pp. 965-979.**

Novel inorganic alkali and alkaline earth hydrides of the formula  $MH^*$ ,  $MH_2^*$ , and  $MH^*X$  wherein  $M$  is the metal,  $X$ , is a halide, and  $H^*$  comprises a novel high binding energy hydride ion were synthesized in a high temperature gas cell by reaction of atomic hydrogen with a catalyst and  $MH$ ,  $MH_2$ , or  $MX$  corresponding to an alkali metal or alkaline earth metal compound, respectively. Novel hydride ions of the corresponding novel hydride compounds were characterized by an extraordinary upfield shifted peak observed by  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. The result were confirmed on five different instruments at five independent laboratories (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL, National Research Council of Canada, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, University of Delaware, Wilmington, DE, and Grace Davison, Columbia, MD).



26. **R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, "Synthesis and Characterization of Potassium Iodo Hydride", Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 25, Issue 12, December, (2000), pp. 1185-1203.**

A novel inorganic hydride compound  $KHI$  which comprises a high binding energy hydride ion was synthesized by reaction of atomic hydrogen with potassium metal and potassium iodide. Potassium iodo hydride was identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA),  $^1H$  and  $^{39}K$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL), Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (Surface Science Laboratories, Mountain View, CA), electrospray ionization time of flight mass spectroscopy (Perkin-Elmer Biosystems, Framingham, MA), liquid chromatography/mass spectroscopy (Ricerca, Inc., Painesville, Ohio), thermal decomposition with analysis by gas chromatography, and mass spectroscopy, and elemental analysis (Galbraith Laboratories, Inc., Knoxville, TN). Hydride ions with increased binding energies may form many novel compounds with broad applications.

25. **R. Mills, "Novel Inorganic Hydride", Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 25, (2000), pp. 669-683.**

A novel inorganic hydride compound  $KHKHCO_3$  which is stable in water and comprises a high binding energy hydride ion was isolated following the electrolysis of a  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte. Inorganic hydride clusters  $K[KHKHCO_3]^+$  were identified by Time of Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy (Charles Evans East, East Windsor, NJ). Moreover, the existence of a novel hydride ion has been determined using X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), and  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL). Hydride ions with increased binding energies may be the basis of a high voltage battery for electric vehicles.

**24. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, T. Shannon, A. Echezuria, "Synthesis and Characterization of Novel Hydride Compounds", Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 4, (2001), pp. 339-367.**

Novel inorganic alkali and alkaline earth hydrides of the formula  $MHX$  and  $MHMX$  wherein  $M$  is the metal,  $X$ , is a singly negatively charged anion, and  $H$  comprises a novel high binding energy hydride ion were synthesized in a high temperature gas cell by reaction of atomic hydrogen with a catalyst and  $MX$  or  $MX_2$  corresponding to an alkali metal or alkaline earth metal, respectively. It has been reported that intense extreme ultraviolet (EUV) emission was observed at low temperatures (e.g.  $\approx 10^3 K$ ) from atomic hydrogen and certain atomized elements or certain gaseous ions which ionize at integer multiples of the potential energy of atomic hydrogen,  $27.2 eV$  [1-5]. These atomized elements or certain gaseous ions comprised the catalyst to form  $MHX$  and  $MHMX$ . For example, atomic hydrogen was reacted with strontium vapor and  $SrBr_2$  to form  $SrHBr$ . Novel hydride compounds such as  $SrHBr$  were identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA),  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL), and thermal decomposition with analysis by gas chromatography, and mass spectroscopy. Hydride ions with increased binding energies form novel compounds with potential broad applications such as a high voltage battery for consumer electronics and electric vehicles. In addition, these novel compositions of matter and associated technologies may have far-reaching applications in many industries including chemical, electronics, computer, military, energy, and aerospace in the form of products such as propellants, solid fuels, surface coatings, structural materials, and chemical processes.

**23. R. Mills, "Highly Stable Novel Inorganic Hydrides", Journal of New Materials for Electrochemical Systems, Vol. 6, (2003), pp. 45-54.**

Novel inorganic hydride compounds  $KHKHCO_3$  and  $KH$  were isolated following the electrolysis of a  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte. The compounds which comprised high binding energy hydride ions were stable in water, and  $KH$  was stable at elevated temperature (600 °C). Inorganic hydride clusters  $K[KHKHCO_3]^+$  were identified by positive Time of Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS) of  $KHKHCO_3$  (Charles Evans East, East Windsor, NJ). The negative ToF-SIMS was dominated by hydride ion. The positive and negative ToF-SIMS of  $KH$  showed essentially  $K^+$  and  $H^-$  only, respectively. Moreover, the existence of novel hydride ions was determined using X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), and  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL). Hydride ions with increased binding energies may be the basis of a high voltage battery for electric vehicles.

**22. R. Mills, "Novel Hydrogen Compounds from a Potassium Carbonate Electrolytic Cell", *Fusion Technology*, Vol. 37, No. 2, March, (2000), pp. 157-182.**

Novel compounds containing hydrogen in new hydride and polymeric states which demonstrate novel hydrogen chemistry have been isolated following the electrolysis of a  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte with the production of excess energy. Inorganic hydride clusters  $K[KHKHCO_3]^+$  and hydrogen polymer ions such as  $OH_{23}^+$  and  $H_{16}^-$  were identified by time of flight secondary ion mass spectroscopy (Charles Evans East, East Windsor, NJ). The presence of compounds containing new states of hydrogen were confirmed by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA), X-ray diffraction, Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (Surface Science Laboratories, Mountain View, CA), Raman spectroscopy (Environmental Catalysis and Materials Laboratory of Virginia Polytechnic Institute), and  $^1H$  nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (Spectral Data Services, Inc., Champaign, IL).

**21. Mills, R., Good, W., "Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Hydrogen", *Fusion Technology*, Vol. 28, No. 4, November, (1995), pp. 1697-1719.**

Determination of excess heat release during the electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate by the very accurate and reliable method of heat measurement, flow calorimetry; describes the experimental identification of hydrogen atoms in fractional quantum energy levels—hydrinos—by X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS) (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA); describes the experimental identification of hydrogen atoms in fractional quantum energy levels—hydrinos—by emissions of soft X-rays from dark matter; describes the experimental identification of hydrogen molecules in fractional quantum energy levels—dihydrino molecules by high resolution magnetic sector mass spectroscopy with ionization energy determination, and gives a summary.

In summary:

Excess power and heat were observed during the electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate. Flow calorimetry of pulsed current electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate at a nickel cathode was performed in a single-cell dewar. The average power out of 24.6 watts exceeded the average input power (voltage times current) of 4.73 watts by a factor greater than 5. The total input energy (integration of voltage times current) over the entire duration of the experiment was 5.72 MJ; whereas, the total output energy was 29.8 MJ. No excess heat was observed when the electrolyte was changed from potassium carbonate to sodium carbonate. The source of heat is assigned to the electrocatalytic, exothermic reaction whereby the electrons of hydrogen atoms are induced to undergo transitions to quantized energy levels below the conventional "ground state". These lower energy states correspond to fractional quantum numbers:  $n = 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, \dots$ . Transitions to these lower energy states are stimulated in the presence of pairs of potassium ions ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) which provide 27.2 eV energy sinks.

The identification of the  $n = 1/2$  hydrogen atom,  $H(n = 1/2)$  is reported. Samples of the nickel cathodes of aqueous potassium carbonate electrolytic cells and aqueous

sodium carbonate electrolytic cells were analyzed by XPS (Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA). A broad peak centered at 54.6 eV was present only in the cases of the potassium carbonate cells. The binding energy (in vacuum) of  $H(n = 1/2)$  is 54.4 eV. Thus, the theoretical and measured binding energies for  $H(n = 1/2)$  are in excellent agreement.

Further experimental identification of hydrinos—down to  $H(n = 1/8)$ —can be found in the alternative explanation by Mills et al. for the soft X-ray emissions of the dark interstellar medium observed by Labov and Bowyer [Labov, S., Bowyer, S., "Spectral observations of the extreme ultraviolet background", *The Astrophysical Journal*, 371, (1991), pp. 810-819] of the Extreme UV Center of the University of California, Berkeley. The agreement between the experimental spectrum and the energy values predicted for the proposed transitions is remarkable.

The reaction product of two  $H(n=1/2)$  atoms, the dihydrino molecule, was identified by mass spectroscopy (Shrader Analytical & Consulting Laboratories). The mass spectrum of the cryofiltered gases evolved during the electrolysis of a light water  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte with a nickel cathode demonstrated that the dihydrino molecule,  $H_2\left(n = \frac{1}{2}\right)$ , has a higher ionization energy, about 63 eV, than normal molecular hydrogen,  $H_2(n = 1)$ , 15.46 eV. The high resolution (0.001 AMU) magnetic sector mass spectroscopic analysis of the postcombustion gases indicated the presence of two peaks of nominal mass two-- one peak at 70 eV and one peak at 25 eV. The same analysis of molecular hydrogen indicates only one peak at 25 eV and one peak at 70 eV. In the case of the postcombustion sample at 70 eV, one peak was assigned as the hydrogen molecular ion peak,  $H_2^+(n = 1)$ , and one peak was assigned as the dihydrino molecular peak,  $H_2^+\left(n = \frac{1}{2}\right)$  which has a slightly larger magnetic moment.

**20. Mills, R., Good, W., Shaubach, R., "Dihydrino Molecule Identification", *Fusion Technology*, Vol. 25, 103 (1994).**

Calorimetry of pulsed current and continuous electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) at a nickel cathode was performed by

Thermacore, Inc., Lancaster, PA. The excess power out of 41 watts exceeded the total input power given by the product of the electrolysis voltage and current by a factor greater than 8. Elemental analysis of the electrolyte and metallurgical analysis of the cathode showed no evidence of chemical reactions. The pH, specific gravity, concentration of  $K_2CO_3$ , and the elemental analysis of the electrolyte sample taken after 42 days of continuous operation were unchanged from that of the values obtained for the electrolyte sample taken before operation. Elemental analysis and scanning electron microscopy of metallurgical samples of the nickel cathode taken before operation and at day 56 of continuous operation were identical indicating that the nickel cathode had not changed chemically or physically. Scintillation counter and photographic film measurements showed that no radiation above background was detected indicating that nuclear reactions did not occur.

The "ash" of the exothermic reaction is atoms having electrons of energy below the "ground state" which are predicted to form molecules. The predicted molecules were identified by lack of reactivity with oxygen, by separation from molecular deuterium by cryofiltration, and by mass spectroscopic analysis. The combustion of the gases evolved during the electrolysis of a light water  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) with a nickel cathode was incomplete. The mass spectroscopic analysis (Dr. David Parees of Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.) of the  $m/e = 2$  peak of the combusted gas demonstrated that the dihydrino molecule,  $H_2(n = 1/2)$ , has a higher ionization energy than  $H_2$ .

Calorimetry of pulsed current and continuous electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) at a nickel cathode was performed in single cell dewar calorimetry cells by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation. Excess power out exceeded input power by a factor greater than 16. No excess heat was observed when the electrolyte was changed from potassium carbonate to the control sodium carbonate. The faraday efficiency was measured volumetrically to be 100%.

**19. V. Noninski, Fusion Technol., Vol. 21, 163 (1992).**

Dr. Noninski of the Laboratory for Electrochemistry of Renewed Electrode-Solution Interface (LEPGER) successfully reproduced the results of Mills and Kneizys [R. Mills and S. Kneizys, Fusion Technol. Vol. 20, 65 (1991)] as a visiting professor at Franklin and Marshall College. A significant increase in temperature with every watt input, compared with the calibration experiment ( $\approx 50\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} / \text{W}$  versus  $\approx 30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} / \text{W}$ ), was observed during the electrolysis of potassium carbonate. This effect was not observed when sodium carbonate was electrolyzed. No trivial explanation (in terms of chemical reactions, change in heat transfer properties, etc.) of this effect were found.

18. Niedra, J., Meyers, I., Fralick, G. C., and Baldwin, R., "Replication of the Apparent Excess Heat Effect in a Light Water-Potassium Carbonate-Nickel Electrolytic Cell, NASA Technical Memorandum 107167, February, (1996). pp. 1-20.; Niedra, J., Baldwin, R., Meyers, I., NASA Presentation of Light Water Electrolytic Tests, May 15, 1994.

NASA Lewis tested a cell identical to that of Thermacore [Mills, R., Good, W., Shaubach, R., "Dihydrino Molecule Identification", Fusion Technology, Vol. 25, 103 (1994)] with the exception that it was minus the central cathode. A cell identical to the test cell with heater power only (no electrolysis) was the calibration control and the blank cell with the heater power equal to zero. The test cell was also calibrated "on the fly" by measuring the temperature relative to the blank cell at several values of heater input power of the test cell. "Replication of experiments claiming to demonstrate excess heat production in light water-Ni- $K_2CO_3$  electrolytic cells was found to produce an apparent excess heat of 11 W maximum, for 60 W electrical power into the cell. Power gains ranged from 1.06 to 1.68." The production of excess energy with a power gain of 1.68 would require 0% Faraday efficiency to account for the observed excess power.

17. Technology Insights, 6540 Lusk Boulevard, Suite C-102, San Diego, CA 92121, "HydroCatalysis Technical Assessment Prepared for PacifiCorp", August 2, 1996.

This report documents a technical assessment of a novel source of hydrogen energy advanced by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation now BlackLight Power, Inc. (BLP). The assessment was conducted as part of the due diligence performed for PacifiCorp. It was conducted by a literature search and review, site visits to BLP and collaborating organizations, and telephone interviews with others active in the general area. A description of concept is provided in Section 3. Section 4 presents an assessment of the concept background, supporting theory, laboratory prototypes, projected initial products, and economic and environmental aspects. Section 5 documents the results of telephone interviews and site visits. An overall summary and conclusions are presented in the following section.

**16. P. M. Jansson, "HydroCatalysis: A New Energy Paradigm for the 21st Century", Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Masters of Science in Engineering Degree in the Graduate Division of Rowan University, May 1997, Thesis Advisors: Dr. J. L. Schmalzel, Dr. T. R. Chandrupatla, and Dr. A. J. Marchese, External Advisors: Dr. J. Phillips, Pennsylvania State University, Dr. R. L. Mills, BlackLight Power, Inc., W. R. Good, BlackLight Power, Inc.**

This thesis reviews the problems of worldwide energy supply, describes the current technologies that meet the energy needs of our industrial societies, summarizes the environmental impacts of those fuels and technologies and their increased use by a growing global and increasing technical economy. The work also describes and advances the technology being developed by BlackLight Power, Inc. (BLP) a scientific company located in Princeton, New Jersey. BLP's technology purports to offer commercially viable and useful heat generation via a previously unrecognized natural phenomenon - the catalytic reduction of the hydrogen atom to a lower energy state. Laboratory tests obtained as original research of this thesis as well as the review of the data of others substantiate the fact that replication of the experimental conditions which are favorable to initiating and sustaining the new energy release process will generate controllable, reproducible, sustainable and commercial meaningful heat. For example, Jansson has determined heat production associated with hydrino formation with a



Calvet calorimeter which yielded exceptional results. Specifically, the results are completely consistent with Mills hydrino formation hypothesis. Approximately  $10^{-3}$  moles of hydrogen was admitted to a  $20\text{ cm}^3$  Calvet cell containing a heated platinum filament and  $KNO_3$  powder. In the three separate trials with a platinum filament hydrogen dissociator which was varied in length of 10 cm, 20 cm, and 30 cm, a mean power of 0.581, 0.818, and 1.572 watts was observed, respectively. The closed experiments were run to completion. The energy observed was 622, 369, and 747 kJ, respectively. This is equivalent to the generation of  $6.2 \times 10^8\text{ J/mole}$ ,  $3.7 \times 10^8\text{ J/mole}$ , and  $7.5 \times 10^8\text{ J/mole}$  of hydrogen, respectively, as compared to  $2.5 \times 10^5\text{ J/mole}$  of hydrogen anticipated for standard hydrogen combustion. Thus, the total heats generated appear to be at least 1000 times too large to be explained by conventional chemistry, but the results are completely consistent with Mills model. Convincing evidence is presented to lead to the conclusion that BLP technology has tremendous potential to achieve commercialization and become an energy paradigm for the next century. The research was also conducted as part of the due diligence performed for Atlantic Energy now Connectiv.

**15. Phillips, J., Smith, J., Kurtz, S., "Report On Calorimetric Investigations Of Gas-Phase Catalyzed Hydrino Formation" Final report for Period October-December 1996", January 1, 1997, A Confidential Report submitted to BlackLight Power, Inc. provided by BlackLight Power, Inc., Great Valley Corporate Center, 41 Great Valley Parkway, Malvern, PA 19355.**

Pennsylvania State University Chemical Engineering Department has determined heat production associated with hydrino formation with a Calvet calorimeter which yielded exceptional results. Specifically, the results are completely consistent with Mills hydrino formation hypothesis. In three separate trials, between 10 and 20 K Joules were generated at a rate of 0.5 Watts, upon admission of approximately  $10^{-3}$  moles of hydrogen to the  $20\text{ cm}^3$  Calvet cell containing a heated platinum filament and  $KNO_3$  powder. This is equivalent to the generation of  $10^7\text{ J/mole}$  of hydrogen, as compared to  $2.5 \times 10^5\text{ J/mole}$  of hydrogen anticipated for standard hydrogen combustion. Thus, the

total heats generated appear to be 100 times too large to be explained by conventional chemistry, but the results are completely consistent with Mills model.

- 14. Phillips, J., Shim, H., "Additional Calorimetric Examples of Anomalous Heat from Physical Mixtures of K/Carbon and Pd/Carbon", January 1, 1996, A Confidential Report submitted to HydroCatalysis Power Corporation provided by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Great Valley Corporate Center, 41 Great Valley Parkway, Malvern, PA 19355.**

Pennsylvania State University Chemical Engineering Department has determined excess heat release from flowing hydrogen in the presence of ionic hydrogen spillover catalytic material: 40% by weight potassium nitrate ( $\text{KNO}_3$ ) on graphitic carbon powder with 5% by weight 1%-Pd-on-graphitic carbon ( $\text{K}^+/\text{K}^+$  electrocatalytic couple) by the very accurate and reliable method of heat measurement, thermopile conversion of heat into an electrical output signal. Excess power and heat were observed with flowing hydrogen over the catalyst. However, no excess power was observed with flowing helium over the catalyst mixture. Rates of heat production were reproducibly observed which were higher than that expected from the conversion of all the hydrogen entering the cell to water, and the total energy observed was over four times larger than that expected if all the catalytic material in the cell were converted to the lowest energy state by "known" chemical reactions. Thus, "anomalous" heat, heat of a magnitude and duration which could not be explained by conventional chemistry, was reproducibly observed.

- 13. Bradford, M. C., Phillips, J., "A Calorimetric Investigation of the Reaction of Hydrogen with Sample PSU #1", September 11, 1994, A Confidential Report submitted to HydroCatalysis Power Corporation provided by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Great Valley Corporate Center, 41 Great Valley Parkway, Malvern, PA 19355.**

Pennsylvania State University Chemical Engineering Department has determined excess heat release from flowing hydrogen in the presence of nickel oxide powder

containing strontium niobium oxide ( $\text{Nb}^{3+}/\text{Sr}^{2+}$  electrocatalytic couple) by the very accurate and reliable method of heat measurement, thermopile conversion of heat into an electrical output signal. Excess power and heat were observed with flowing hydrogen over the catalyst which increased with increasing flow rate. However, no excess power was observed with flowing helium over the catalyst/nickel oxide mixture or flowing hydrogen over nickel oxide alone. Approximately 10 cc of nickel oxide powder containing strontium niobium oxide immediately produced 0.55 W of steady state output power at 523 K. When the gas was switched from hydrogen to helium, the power immediately dropped. The switch back to hydrogen restored the excess power output which continued to increase until the hydrogen source cylinder emptied at about the 40,000 second time point. With no hydrogen flow the output power fell to zero.

The source of heat is assigned to the electrocatalytic, exothermic reaction whereby the electrons of hydrogen atoms are induced to undergo transitions to quantized energy levels below the conventional "ground state". These lower energy states correspond to fractional quantum numbers:  $n = 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, \dots$ . Transitions to these lower energy states are stimulated in the presence of pairs of niobium and strontium ions ( $\text{Nb}^{3+}/\text{Sr}^{2+}$  electrocatalytic couple) which provide 27.2 eV energy sinks.

**12. Jacox, M. G., Watts, K. D., "The Search for Excess Heat in the Mills Electrolytic Cell", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, January 7, 1993.**

Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) operated a cell identical to that of Thermacore [Mills, R., Good, W., Shaubach, R., "Dihydrino Molecule Identification", Fusion Technology, Vol. 25, 103 (1994)] except that it was minus the central cathode and that the cell was wrapped in a one-inch layer of urethane foam insulation about the cylindrical surface. The cell was operated in a pulsed power mode. A current of 10 amperes was passed through the cell for 0.2 seconds followed by 0.8 seconds of zero current for the current cycle. The cell voltage was about 2.4 volts, for an average input power of 4.8 W. The electrolysis power average was 1.84 W, and the stirrer power was measured to be 0.3 W. Thus, the total average net input power was 2.14 W. The cell

was operated at various resistance heater settings, and the temperature difference between the cell and the ambient as well as the heater power were measured. The results of the excess power as a function of cell temperature with the cell operating in the pulsed power mode at 1 Hz with a cell voltage of 2.4 volts, a peak current of 10 amperes, and a duty cycle of 20 % showed that the excess power is temperature dependent for pulsed power operation, and the maximum excess power was 18 W for an input electrolysis joule heating power of 2.14 W. Thus, the ratio of excess power to input electrolysis joule heating power was 850 %. INEL scientists constructed an electrolytic cell comprising a nickel cathode, a platinized titanium anode, and a 0.57 M  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte. The cell design appears in Appendix 1. The cell was operated in the environmental chamber in the INEL Battery Test Laboratory at constant current, and the heat was removed by forced air convection in two cases. In the first case, the air was circulated by the environmental chamber circulatory system alone. In the second case, an additional forced air fan was directed onto the cell. The cell was equipped with a water condenser, and the water addition to the cell due to electrolysis losses was measured. The data of the forced convection heat loss calorimetry experiments during the electrolysis of a 0.57 M  $K_2CO_3$  electrolyte with the INEL cell showed that 13 W of excess power was produced. This excess power could not be attributed to recombination of the hydrogen and oxygen as indicated by the equivalence of the calculated and measured water balance.

**11. Peterson, S., H., Evaluation of Heat Production from Light Water Electrolysis Cells of HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Report from Westinghouse STC, 1310 Beulah Road, Pittsburgh, PA, February 25, 1994.**

Westinghouse Electric Corporation reports that excess heat was observed during the electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) where the electrolysis of aqueous sodium carbonate served as the control. The data of the temperature of the cell minus the ambient temperature shows that when potassium carbonate replaced sodium carbonate in the same cell with the same input electrolysis power, the potassium experiment was twice as hot as the sodium carbonate experiment

for the duration of the experiment, one month. The net faraday efficiency of gas evolution was experimentally measured to be unity by weighing the experiment to determine that the expected rate of water consumption was observed. The output power exceeded the total input power. The data was analyzed by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation [Mills, R., Analysis by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation of Westinghouse Report Entitled "Evaluation of Heat Production from Light Water Electrolysis Cells of HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Report from Westinghouse STC", February 25, 1994].

**10. Haldeman, C. W., Savoye, G. W., Iseler, G. W., Clark, H. R., MIT Lincoln Laboratories Excess Energy Cell Final report ACC Project 174 (3), April 25, 1995.**

During the electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate, researchers working at MIT Lincoln Laboratories observed long duration excess power of 1-5 watts with output/input ratios over 10 in some cases with respect to the cell input power reduced by the enthalpy of the generated gas. In these cases, the output was 1.5 to 4 times the integrated volt-ampere power input. Faraday efficiency was measured volumetrically by direct water displacement.

**9. Craw-Ivanco, M. T.; Tremblay, R. P.; Boniface, H. A.; Hilborn, J. W.; "Calorimetry for a  $\text{Ni}/\text{K}_2\text{CO}_3$  Cell", Atomic Energy Canada Limited, Chemical Engineering Branch, Chalk River Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, June 1994.**

Atomic Energy Canada Limited, Chalk River Laboratories, report that 128 % and 138% excess heat were observed in separate experiments by flow calorimetry during the electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate ( $\text{K}^+/\text{K}^+$  electrocatalytic couple) in a closed cell, and that 138% was observed in an open cell.

**8. Shaubach, R. M., Gernert, N. J., "Anomalous Heat From Hydrogen in Contact with Potassium Carbonate", Thermacore Report, March 1994.**

A high temperature/high pressure/high power density industrial prototype gas cell power generator which produced 50 watts of power at 300 °C having a nickel surface area of only 300 cm<sup>2</sup> was successfully developed. A sample of the nickel tubing of the aqueous potassium carbonate permeation cell was analyzed by XPS at the Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA. A broad peak centered at 54.6 eV was present; whereas, the control nickel tube showed no feature. The binding energy (in vacuum) of H(n = 1/2) is 54.4 eV. Thus, the theoretical and measured binding energies for H(n = 1/2) are in excellent agreement. No excess energy or 54.6 eV feature were observed when sodium carbonate replaced potassium carbonate.

**7. Gernert, N., Shaubach, R. M., Mills, R., Good, W., "Nascent Hydrogen: An Energy Source," Final Report prepared by Thermacore, Inc., for the Aero Propulsion and Power Directorate, Wright Laboratory, Air Force Material Command (ASC), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Contract Number F33615-93-C-2326, May, (1994).**

In a report prepared for the Aero Propulsion and Power Directorate, Wright Laboratory, Air Force Material Command (ASC), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Thermacore reports, "anomalous heat was observed from a reaction of atomic hydrogen in contact with potassium carbonate on a nickel surface. The nickel surface consisted of 500 feet of 0.0625 inch diameter tubing wrapped in a coil. The coil was inserted into a pressure vessel containing a light water solution of potassium carbonate. The tubing and solution were heated to a steady state temperature of 249 °C using an I<sup>2</sup>R heater. Hydrogen at 1100 psig was applied to the inside of the tubing. After the application of hydrogen, a 32 °C increase in temperature of the cell was measured which corresponds to 25 watts of heat. Heat production under these conditions is predicted by the theory of Mills where a new species of hydrogen is produced that has a lower energy state than normal hydrogen. ESCA analysis, done independently by Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, have found the predicted 55 eV signature of this new species of hydrogen."

**6. Wiesmann, H., Brookhaven National Laboratory, Department of Applied Science, Letter to Dr. Walter Polansky of the Department of Energy Regarding Excess Energy Verification at Brookhaven National Laboratory, October 16, 1991.**

Calorimetry of continuous electrolysis of aqueous potassium carbonate ( $K^+/K^+$  electrocatalytic couple) at a nickel cathode was performed in single cell dewar calorimetry cell by Noninski at Brookhaven National Laboratory. Dr. Weismann observed the experiment and reported the results to Dr. Walter Polansky of the U. S. Department of Energy. Dr. Weismann reports, "The claim is as follows. The temperature rise in the dewar is greater in the case of electrolysis as compared to using a resistor, even though the power dissipated is equal in both cases. According to Dr. Mills' theory, this apparent "excess power" is due to the fact that the electron in a hydrogen atom can "decay" to stable subinteger quantum levels. Dr. Noninski demonstrated this thermal effect at BNL." The observed rise in temperature for a given input power was twice as high comparing electrolysis versus heater power.

**5. Nesterov, S. B., Kryukov, A. P., Moscow Power Engineering Institute Affidavit, February, 26, 1993.**

The Moscow Power Engineering Institute experiments showed 0.75 watts of heat output with only 0.3 watts of total power input (power = VI) during the electrolysis of an aqueous potassium carbonate electrolyte with a nickel foil cathode and a platinized titanium anode. Excess power over the total input on the order of 0.45 watts was produced reliably and continuously over a period of three months. Evaluation of the electrolyte after three months of operation showed no significant change in its density or molar concentration. The cell was disassembled and inspected after over one month of operation at 0.1 amperes. This inspection showed no visible signs of a reaction between the electrodes and the electrolyte. The cell was re-assembled and operated as before. Excess energy was produced for the three month duration of the experiment. Scintillation counter measurements showed no signs of radiation external to the cell.

**4. Miller, A., Simmons, G., Lehigh X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Report, Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University Bethlehem, PA, November 1993.**

Samples of the nickel cathodes of aqueous potassium carbonate electrolytic cells and aqueous sodium carbonate electrolytic cells were analyzed by XPS by Miller and Simmons of the Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA. A broad peak centered at 54.6 eV was present only in the cases of the potassium carbonate cells. The binding energy (in vacuum) of  $H(n = 1/2)$  is 54.4 eV. Thus, the theoretical and measured binding energies for  $H(n = 1/2)$  are in excellent agreement. Lehigh University has conducted an extensive investigation of the cathodes from heat producing as well as those from control cells. Miller concludes that "I was unable to find any other elements on the surface that cause the feature. The persistent appearance of a spectral feature near the predicted binding energy for many of the electrodes used with a K electrolyte is an encouraging piece of evidence for the existence of the reduced energy state hydrogen".

**3. Jacox, M. G., Watts, K. D., "INEL XPS Report", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, November 1993.**

The Lehigh XPS results of a broad peak centered at 54.6 eV present only in the cases of the potassium carbonate cells [Miller, A., Simmons, G., Lehigh X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Report, Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, November 1993] were confirmed at Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL). Samples which demonstrated the feature as well as control electrodes were tested for the presence of trace amounts of impurities of the elements iron and lithium at a sensitivity level of greater than 1000 times that of XPS. TOF-SIMS (Time of Flight-Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy) and XPS analysis of the nickel surface was performed by Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA [Lee, Jang-Jung, Charles Evans & Associates Time-Of-Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy (TOF-SIMS) Surface Analysis Report, CE&A Number 40150, March 18, 1994]. The 54.6 eV feature was also observed by Charles Evans & Associates in the case of cathodes of potassium carbonate electrolytic cells [Craig, A.,



Y., Charles Evans & Associates XPS/ESCA Results, CE&A Number 44545, November 3, 1994]. Iron and lithium were the only remaining atoms which were in question by Lehigh University and INEL as the source of the 54.6 eV XPS peak. The Charles Evans TOF-SIMS results demonstrate that iron and lithium were not the source of this peak.

**2. Lee, Jang-Jung, Charles Evans & Associates Time-Of-Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy (TOF-SIMS) Surface Analysis Report, CE&A Number 40150, March 18, 1994.**

The Lehigh XPS results of a broad peak centered at 54.6 eV present only in the cases of the potassium carbonate cells [Miller, A., Simmons, G., Lehigh X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Report, Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, November 1993] were confirmed at Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) [Jacox, M. G., Watts, K. D., "INEL XPS Report", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, November 1993]. Samples which demonstrated the feature as well as control electrodes were tested for the presence of trace amounts of impurities of the elements iron and lithium at a sensitivity level of greater than 1000 times that of XPS. TOF-SIMS (Time of Flight-Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy) and XPS analysis of the nickel surface was performed by Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA. The 54.6 eV feature was also observed by Charles Evans & Associates in the case of cathodes of potassium carbonate electrolytic cells [Jacox, M. G., Watts, K. D., "INEL XPS Report", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, November 1993]. Iron and lithium were the only remaining atoms which were in question by Lehigh University and INEL as the source of the 54.6 eV XPS peak. The Charles Evans TOF-SIMS results demonstrate that iron and lithium were not the source of this peak.

**1. Craig, A., Y., Charles Evans & Associates XPS/ESCA Results, CE&A Number 44545, November 3, 1994.**

The Lehigh XPS results of a broad peak centered at 54.6 eV present only in the cases of the potassium carbonate cells [Miller, A., Simmons, G., Lehigh X-Ray

Photoelectron Spectroscopy Report, Zettlemoyer Center for Surface Studies, Sinclair Laboratory, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, November 1993] were confirmed at Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) [Jacox, M. G., Watts, K. D., "INEL XPS Report", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, November 1993]. Samples which demonstrated the feature as well as control electrodes were tested for the presence of trace amounts of impurities of the elements iron and lithium at a sensitivity level of greater than 1000 times that of XPS. TOF-SIMS (Time of Flight-Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy) and XPS analysis of the nickel surface was performed by Charles Evans & Associates, Sunnyvale, CA [Lee, Jang-Jung, Charles Evans & Associates Time-Of-Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectroscopy (TOF-SIMS) Surface Analysis Report, CE&A Number 40150, March 18, 1994]. The 54.6 eV feature was also observed by Charles Evans & Associates in the case of cathodes of potassium carbonate electrolytic cells. Iron and lithium were the only remaining atoms which were in question by Lehigh University and INEL as the source of the 54.6 eV XPS peak. The Charles Evans TOF-SIMS results demonstrate that iron and lithium were not the source of this peak.

Given Applicant's full compliance with the new standards imposed by Specialist McGinty during the February 11, 2003 Interview, which required independent validation of the experimental evidence of record, Applicant is entitled to have this evidence accepted as reliable and to have this and other BlackLight applications issue as patents.

**Examiner Langel's Reaffirmation of the Utility and Operability of Applicant's Novel Hydrogen Technology and His Subsequent Resignation From Examining BlackLight Cases "For Moral and Ethical Reasons"**

Pursuant to the representations and agreements made during the February 11, 2003 Interview (reprinted below), Applicant followed up by submitting much of the independently generated scientific evidence cited above in two pending BlackLight applications and arranging an Interview with Examiner Langel, who was assigned to those cases and supposedly had full authority to issue them. [U.S. Serial Nos. 09/110,678 ('678 application) and 09/362,693 ('693 application).] The express purpose of the Interview, held on April 14, 2003, was to review those two applications on a claim-by-claim basis to ensure that the scientific data presented adequately supported the

scope of the claims. Examiner Langel expressed once again his view that the claims of the two applications were adequately supported by the data and, therefore, those claims were allowable.

A detailed account of the discussions Applicant's counsel, Jeffrey Melcher and Jeffrey Simenauer, had with Examiner Langel during the April 14, 2003 Interview, and with Examiner Langel and his supervisor, SPE Stanley Silverman, during follow-up telephone Interviews were documented in Supplemental Responses filed in the '678 and '693 applications, comments from which are reproduced below. Based on the shocking revelations divulged during these discussions, Applicant must once again protest in the strongest terms possible the manner in which an anonymous group of PTO officials (*i.e.*, the "Secret Committee") has mishandled the examination of BlackLight's patent applications relating to Applicant's novel hydrogen technology.

Counsel was particularly distressed to learn that when Examiner Langel met with Supervisor Silverman to advocate allowing the '678 and '693 applications to issue as patents, his supervisor informed him that "allowance is not an option." Despite the Examiner's careful study of the overwhelming weight of the scientific data supporting allowance, his supervisor further instructed him to "make it appear as if you have authority [to allow the applications] and that you are in favor of full rejection."

Understandably, Examiner Langel felt uneasy having been asked to make representations on the record that were not true. He explained that, "for moral and ethical reasons," he had no choice but to allow himself to be removed from examining all assigned BlackLight applications. Although Supervisor Silverman admitted that the removal decision had been made "partially by [him] and partially by others," he would not reveal who those "others" were.

Applicant strongly objects to Examiner Langel's removal under these egregious circumstances and demands that the PTO reinstate him immediately and allow BlackLight's applications to issue. The Secret Committee is duty bound to honor the representations and agreements made by Quality Assurance Specialist Douglas McGinty during the February 11, 2003 Interview, declaring that:

- (1) Examiner Langel and the other Examiners of record have "full authority" to review the scientific data supporting lower energy states of hydrogen

generated and furnished by independent third parties and, based on that review, to issue patents as deemed appropriate;

- (2) Applicant should confer with the Examiners, either by telephone or in person, to review each assigned application on a claim-by-claim basis to ensure that the scientific data presented adequately supports the scope of the claims; and
- (3) for those claims determined to be adequately supported by the data, a patent will issue; for any claims deemed to be inadequately supported, Applicant reserves the right to continue seeking that broader claim coverage in subsequent proceedings. [See March 6, 2003 Response filed in the '678 application.]

It was precisely because of the many prior abuses that led to this short-lived "breakthrough" that U.S. Congressman David Wu sent his Senior Legislative Assistant, Ted Liu, to attend the February 11 Interview. Prior to the Interview, a senior PTO official alleged to Mr. Liu that there was no "Secret Committee." At the Interview, Mr. Liu witnessed not only Specialist McGinty's representation that Examiner Langel had the authority to allow BlackLight's applications, but the Examiner's unequivocal statement that the applications were, in fact, allowable and that he was prepared to issue Applicant his patents right then and there. [See *supra* and Attachment P.]

Despite those representations, an anonymous group of individuals has now declared that allowance is not even an option in BlackLight's cases. Worse yet, this Secret Committee sought to leave the false impression on the record that Examiner Langel—and perhaps other Examiners of record—had the authority to allow BlackLight's applications, and that he favored the rejection of claims over allowance.

In view of this unfortunate incident, which is described in greater detail below, Applicant is entitled to a complete accounting of events leading to Examiner Langel's removal, including identification of all persons involved in making that decision.

#### **Detailed Account of the April 14, 2003 Interview and Subsequent Discussions**

As stated above, the express purpose of the April 14, 2003 Interview was to review the scientific data generated and furnished by independent third parties identified in the March 6, 2003 Response that was filed in the '678 and '693 applications in

support of the lower energy states of hydrogen and to ensure that the data adequately supported the scope of the claims to secure their allowance.

Applicant had no reason to suspect that this new approach, as agreed to during the prior February 11, 2003 Interview, was about to be completely scrapped. During the subsequent April 14, 2003 Interview, Examiner Langel once again reaffirmed his long-held opinion that the scientific data submitted by Applicant confirmed the operability of his novel hydrogen technology, thus warranting patent protection. The Examiner's comments made clear that, prior to the interview, he had extensively reviewed Applicant's data, as well as the summary statements characterizing that data, appearing in the prior Responses filed in the '678 and '693 applications. Based on that review, Examiner Langel expressed several times during the Interview his willingness to allow those cases. Those views were confirmed by the Examiner in his interview summary, which stated that "[t]he participants presented data establishing the existence of lower-energy hydrogen." [See April 14, 2003 Interview Summary Form filed in the '678 and '693 applications (Attachment F).]

Examiner Langel, however, refrained from indicating allowance of any specific claims for two stated reasons. First, a few items of submitted data summarized in the March 6 Response inexplicably could not be located in the PTO files. The Examiner wanted time to confirm the data had been made of record, as well as Applicant's description of its relevance. Second, despite Specialist McGinty's representation at the February 11 Interview that Examiner Langel had full authority to review the data and to issue claims in the two interviewed cases, the Examiner explained that he needed to advise him and Supervisor Silverman of his intention to do so.

Examiner Langel then recalled a recent visit to his office by Group Director Jacqueline Stone informing him—again, contrary to what Applicant was told at the February 11, 2003 Interview—that he did not have authority to issue Notices of Allowance, or to otherwise give indications of allowance, in any BlackLight applications. Director Stone instructed Examiner Langel that he would need Specialist McGinty's permission before doing so.

Examiner Langel did, however, note that Supervisor Silverman and Specialist McGinty had agreed before the February 11 Interview to allow claims if Applicant could

show that his submitted scientific data was generated by independent third parties. The Examiner reassured counsel that he would present to his superiors the scientific data discussed at the April 14 Interview with a recommendation of allowance consistent with his past views.

Applicant's counsel agreed that it made sense to allow time for Examiner Langel to discuss the case with his superiors and for counsel to resubmit the few missing items of scientific data, whereupon arrangement was made to continue with the personal Interview on the following day, April 15<sup>th</sup>. That morning, however, counsel received a distressing telephone message from Examiner Langel that the Interview had been canceled. The Examiner stated that Supervisor Silverman had removed him from the subject cases and that he was no longer assigned to any BlackLight applications.

Applicant's counsel immediately telephoned Examiner Langel for a further explanation of what had happened. The Examiner confirmed his removal following the meeting he had arranged with Supervisor Silverman to discuss the scientific data that had been the subject of the previous day's Interview and to advocate allowance of the claims in the two subject applications. Examiner Langel informed counsel that his supervisor refused to even look at the data and, in response to his recommendation of allowance, Supervisor Silverman told him "allowance is not an option." According to Examiner Langel he was then told: "Make it appear as if you have authority [to allow the applications] and that you are in favor of full rejection."

Examiner Langel explained that, regrettably, he had no choice but to resign from further examination of BlackLight's applications. According to the Examiner, Supervisor Silverman gave him the option of staying on, "but not really—I could not go on like this." He explained that "for moral and ethical reasons," he could no longer continue to examine his assigned cases.

Alarmed by this sudden turn of events, counsel called Supervisor Silverman the following day, April 16<sup>th</sup>, to protest Examiner Langel's removal and to seek his reinstatement. Supervisor Silverman confirmed that Examiner Langel would no longer be examining Blacklight's patent applications and that all of its cases were in the process of being consolidated and transferred to a new Examiner.

Counsel kindly requested that Supervisor Silverman explain why those cases were being transferred and who made that decision. He initially refused to discuss the matter, saying only that, "I am not going to be put on the stand and cross examined on this." Upon further prodding, Supervisor Silverman volunteered that "the decision was made partially by me and partially by others." He refused, however, to be more specific when asked to identify the "others" involved in the decision, stating "I am not going to discuss that. You can say that it was *my* decision."

Counsel then informed Supervisor Silverman of Applicant's intention to file an objection to Examiner Langel's removal and to the consolidation and transfer of BlackLight's applications to a new Examiner. Counsel explained that Applicant had expended enormous amounts of time and money over a period of many years prosecuting BlackLight's patent applications before Examiner Langel and getting him up to speed on the claimed technology and the extensive scientific data confirming its operation. Counsel argued that it was unfair to remove Examiner Langel and transfer all of BlackLight's cases to a new Examiner just to begin the process all over again. Supervisor Silverman would hear none of it, again stating, "I'm not going to discuss it."

Applicant's counsel made one last attempt to learn the identity of the other PTO officials responsible for taking this drastic action and their reasons for doing so. Supervisor Silverman again refused this request for information, snapping at counsel, "You figure it out!" Counsel then asked the Supervisor whom they might talk to so they could "figure it out" as he had put it. Supervisor Silverman advised counsel, "Talk to whomever you want," but when asked whom specifically he had in mind, he again retorted, "I don't like to be cross-examined."<sup>125</sup>

At the end of the conversation, Supervisor Silverman attempted to justify the PTO's extreme actions by claiming that it was in the "best interest" to transfer the applications. But, when asked by counsel whose best interest was being served by the transfer, he refused to answer. Supervisor Silverman, however, did offer the stunning revelation that Applicant's novel hydrogen technology was "beyond Examiner Langel's

---

<sup>125</sup> Counsel has taken steps "to figure it out" and expressly reserves the right to further supplement the objections raised herein as additional facts come to light. (Attachment R)

technical expertise" and that all of BlackLight's cases would be consolidated and transferred to another examiner with "more technical expertise." He would not elaborate on who this new, more highly qualified Examiner might be.<sup>126</sup>

Needless to say, at no time during the five years Applicant had been prosecuting his patent applications before Examiner Langel—who has over thirty years of Patent Office experience—did his technical expertise ever come into question. Indeed, throughout the lengthy prosecution of these cases, counsel has been impressed with the Examiner's in-depth knowledge of chemistry and physics, as well as other scientific principles, underlying Applicant's technology. That Supervisor Silverman would raise Examiner Langel's technical competence as an issue at such a late stage of that prosecution only heightens Applicant's suspicions as to the real motivation for removing Examiner Langel.

Immediately following the conversation with Supervisor Silverman, counsel telephoned Examiner Langel one last time to apprise him of the situation and to thank him for his many years of service in examining BlackLight's applications. Examiner Langel expressed regret over his removal from those cases and confirmed that he had "learned a lot about [BlackLight's] technology." The Examiner also expressed surprise that his expertise was now being called into question.

Examiner Langel shared counsel's exasperation over the situation. Counsel asked him if he knew of any other instances in which a PTO Examiner had been instructed to represent that he had authority to allow an application when, in fact, he had no such authority, and that he favored rejecting claims when he actually wanted to allow them. The Examiner's exact words were: "I've never seen anything like it."

Frankly, neither has Applicant's counsel and, in view of these unique circumstances, Applicant must once again strenuously object to the abusive treatment to which his applications have been subjected.

---

<sup>126</sup> All of BlackLight's applications have now been consolidated under the direction of a newly identified Examiner, Dr. Bernard Eng-Kie Souw, whose views have been adopted by the Committee in rejecting Applicant's cases in the name of four Examiners: Examiners Kalafut, Tsang-Foster, Wells, and Tanner. Applicant notes, however, that Dr. Souw is far less experienced in patent matters than his predecessor, Examiner Langel. Furthermore, as discussed in detail below, Dr. Souw's views are not only technically inaccurate, but are also tainted due to a genuine conflict of interest based on his involvement in questionable outside business activities while examining Applicant's cases.



**The Secret Committee Has Demonstrated Extreme Bias In Its Handling of BlackLight's Patent Applications Due to a Genuine Conflict of Interest**

Following Examiner Langel's unfortunate resignation from examining BlackLight's applications, the Committee consolidated those cases under a new, allegedly more experienced Examiner. Consequently, the Committee's rejections of Applicant's claims in this and other pending BlackLight applications based on inoperability due to the alleged non-existence of lower-energy hydrogen now rely heavily, if not almost exclusively, on the views expressed by that new Examiner, Dr. Bernard Eng-Kie Souw. Indeed, Dr. Souw is known to have prepared on behalf of the Committee over one hundred pages of arguments, which in one form or another, have now found their way into all of BlackLight's cases forming the basis for the Committee's erroneous rejections.

As explained in more detail below, Dr. Souw's involvement in shaping the Committee's views in this case has raised serious concerns regarding the bias of those views due to a genuine conflict of interest. As Applicant has shown, that conflict arises out of Dr. Souw's continuing work as the lead scientist for a company he owns that provides consulting services and conducts research in the same technical fields as Applicant while Dr. Souw simultaneously examines Applicant's pending patent applications. Because Dr. Souw's biased views have so tainted the present rejections, the Committee must immediately withdraw those rejections so that the pending claims can be allowed to issue.

Rather than address the issues surrounding the impropriety of Dr. Souw's outside business interests, the Committee initially denied the existence of a conflict by falsely claiming that Dr. Souw's company was merely a former employer of the Examiner. Faced, however, with Applicant's incontrovertible evidence of Dr. Souw's continuing role as owner and lead scientist for BMS, the Committee took several new, and often inconsistent, positions in subsequent Office Actions that were no more convincing. In its latest arguments denying the existence of a conflict, the Committee contradicts itself yet again, this time by recognizing the operability of BlackLight's technology in terms of its use of hydrinos, as distinguished from BMS's related technology, which it claims "do[es] not necessarily require the use of hydrinos."

Having made that distinction, the Committee cannot have it both ways. It must either: (1) drop the § 101 and § 112 rejections in all pending BlackLight applications in recognition of the operability of its hydrino technology; or (2) concede that there is no significant difference between the technical fields practiced by BMS and BlackLight and therefore, that examination of BlackLight's cases by the current founder and lead scientist of BMS creates a genuine conflict of interest.

**The Committee's Continued Refusal To Disclose the Details of  
Dr. Souw's Employment History Raises Serious Questions  
Of Whether It Is Capable Of Fairly Examining Applicant's Cases**

The Committee's appointment of Dr. Souw came at a critical juncture in the examination of Applicant's pending cases. As explained above, in April 2003, Examiner Langel, one of the two original examiners assigned to these cases, had resigned from his examining duties "for moral and ethical reasons." Examiner Langel's abrupt resignation came after being instructed to misrepresent that he favored denying Applicant his patents when the record showed he wanted to allow those patents to issue, and that he had authority to grant such allowance when, in fact, he was told that "allowance is not an option."

To justify Examiner Langel's resignation after the fact, the PTO informed Applicant that his cases were being transferred and consolidated under the direction of an Examiner with "more technical experience." A few short weeks later, Dr. Souw began making appearances in Applicant's cases even though he had only a few years of experience as an Associate Examiner, as compared to Primary Examiner Langel, who had over thirty years of PTO examining experience. [See Appendix attached to the Committee's May 7, 2003 Office Action issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/513,768 ('768 application).] The questionability of the Committee's move is further demonstrated by Examiner Langel's far superior technical understanding of Applicant's technology, as compared to the erroneous arguments that permeate Dr. Souw's Appendices.

Applicant was naturally suspicious of Dr. Souw's prominent membership on the Committee given the abusive treatment Applicant has suffered during the examination of his pending applications, as already discussed. As further explained below, this new

appointment prompted Applicant to raise initial questions regarding Dr. Souw's employment history after he first showed bias in examining these cases by citing his own technical papers against Applicant. Rather than answer those questions, the Committee stonewalled once again, defensively arguing that:

[T]he employment history of examiners, including those acting in a consulting role, is irrelevant to the examination thereof, except where there is a genuine conflict of interest. [See 4/14/04 Office Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/008,947 at p. 5.]

Dr. Souw has been similarly uncooperative, although he did provide some limited information regarding his employment history by citing to his background in microwave plasmas based on work he did almost two decades ago:

Since the cited Examiner's papers cannot possibly have been criticized by Applicant, citing his own publication(s) does not make the Examiner's view "biased", as alleged by Applicant. In the contrary, such technical papers provide a solid evidence that the Examiner is in possession of sufficient background for evaluating Applicant's claimed invention. In this regard, the Examiner can add a further evidence of strong background in microwave plasmas generated in a resonance cavity similar to those used by Applicant, not only in theory, but also hands-on in its design, construction and routine operation, as well as in its spectroscopy, both low and high resolutions [1]. [Souw Appendix at p. 4 attached to the March 29, 2004 Office Action filed in the '768 application.]

The reference [1] cited by the Examiner as evidence of his supposed "strong background in microwave plasmas" is an article published in March 1987: Souw, Eng-Kie, Plasma density measurement in an imperfect microwave cavity, J. Appl. Phys. 61 (5), 1 March 1987.<sup>127</sup>

The Committee's defensive remarks regarding the irrelevancy of Dr. Souw's employment history, when contrasted with the Examiner's own remarks extolling the relevancy of that history, are truly astounding. The Committee's statements are even more remarkable in light of additional information that has come to Applicant's attention

---

<sup>127</sup> Ironically, Dr. Souw attempts to establish his credibility in evaluating Applicant's novel hydrogen technology by citing his peer-reviewed article published in the *Journal of Applied Physics*, yet argues that Applicant's article published in that very same journal does not deserve similar credibility. In taking those contradictory positions, the Committee reveals yet another double standard that only reinforces its obvious bias against Applicant.

concerning Dr. Souw's engagement in questionable business activities that began before, and has continued after, all of BlackLight's pending applications were consolidated and assigned to Dr. Souw.

This information came to light only after Applicant, unable to get straight answers from the Committee regarding Dr. Souw's background, undertook his own investigation into the Examiner's employment history. That investigation uncovered a much more recent 2003 article authored by Dr. Souw, in which he admits that he works as the lead scientist for a consulting company that he co-founded, BMS Enterprise (BMS) in Herndon, Virginia, at the same time he works for the PTO examining BlackLight's applications. [Attachment S] Dr. Souw also admits in the article that his business activities for BMS includes work in at least two technical areas, which are identical to, and therefore compete with, those practiced by BlackLight.<sup>128</sup>

Given that one of those technical areas is microwave plasmas, it is highly suspicious that the Committee and Dr. Souw withheld this highly relevant, up-to-date work experience in support of his supposedly "strong background in microwave plasmas," citing instead an outdated 1987 article in support. The Committee's withholding of this critically important information lends support to Applicant's showing that Dr. Souw's ownership of, and work for, an ongoing business enterprise in competition with Applicant while examining his pending patents applications, in clear violation of the PTO's own ethics rules, constitutes a genuine conflict of interest. As a consequence, the ability of the Committee under the direction of Dr. Souw to fairly evaluate the merits of Applicant's novel hydrogen technology, yet again, has been called into serious question.

The above-mentioned article was published in *Optical Engineering* on November 2, 2003. [Souw, Bernard Eng-Kie, Coherent telescope array with self-homodyne interferometric detection for optical communications, Opt. Eng. 42(1) 3139-3157

---

<sup>128</sup> Incredibly, since the time Applicant first brought this information to the PTO's attention in his October 14, 2004 Response filed in U.S. Patent App'n Ser. No. 09/008,947, and subsequently in other pending cases, not only has the PTO failed to seriously address the issues raised, but it continues to cite and rely on Dr. Souw's biased arguments. These actions leave Applicant no choice but to seek other avenues of relief from this unfair treatment.

(November 2003) (Attachment S).] As the author of that article, Dr. Souw prominently identifies himself on the first page (p. 3139) and his association with BMS as follows:

Bernard Eng-Kie Souw  
BMS Enterprise  
P.O. Box 5524  
Herndon, Virginia 20172-5524  
E-mail: souw1@juno.com

The last page of the article (p. 3157) is particularly informative as it summarizes Dr. Souw's technical background and work experience establishing his connection to BMS as its co-founder and lead scientist. Applicant reproduces the following relevant portions of that background summary, which notably describes BMS as providing consulting services in two main technical areas, microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis and applications, that are identical to those practiced by BlackLight:

In 1985, [Bernard Eng-Kie Souw] joined Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) in Long Island, New York as staff member in a Star Wars project. He was awarded a Department of Energy research grant in 1993 and became Principal Investigator in a research and development project on a novel, solar blind and fieldable alpha-beta-gamma radiation detector in collaboration with Northrop-Grumman and New Jersey Institute of Technology. **About the same time he cofounded BMS Enterprise, a multi-interdisciplinary consulting company providing services mainly in microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis and applications. He left BNL in 1997 and became a patent examiner with the US Patent and Trademark Office in Arlington, Virginia until 2000, when he joined ITT Industries in Reston, Virginia as a scientist and engineering specialist in optical communications. He left ITT in 2002 to dedicate more time as lead scientist with BMS Enterprise.** [Emphasis added.]

As the Committee is no doubt aware, Applicant's novel hydrogen technology has many potential commercial applications, including the aforementioned microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis. Indeed, Applicant presently has on file two copending applications directed to these specific art areas. [See U.S. App'n Ser. No. 10/469,913, filed March 7, 2002; and PCT/US/13412, filed May 1, 2002.] Applicant has serious concerns that the overlap of these and other competitive technologies that BMS and BlackLight engage in may have affected, and will continue to affect, Dr.

Souw's examination and rejection of BlackLight's applications on behalf of the Committee.

This situation is particularly disturbing in light of PTO ethics rules that prohibit patent examiners from engaging in outside business activities that conflict with their assigned administrative duties. [See *Summary of Ethics Rules* for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of the General Counsel, Ethics Division (2000) (Attachment S).] As the introductory paragraph to these ethical rules makes clear, the issue involved here is one of public trust:

### **PUBLIC SERVICE IS A PUBLIC TRUST**

As an employee of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office you have been placed in a position of trust and are held to a high standard of ethical conduct. This handout contains a summary of the rules set forth in conflict of interest statutes and the *Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch*. [Ethics Rules at p. 1 (Attachment S).]

To hold examiners to this high standard of ethical conduct, the rules prohibit activities that would create a financial conflict of interest:

**Financial Conflicts of Interest.** You may not, as part of your official Government duties, participate in any matter that will have a direct and predictable effect on your personal financial interest, unless an exemption applies. This rule applies to matters involving specific parties in which you have a financial interest and to broad policy matters that affect many entities, including ones in which you have an interest (such as a policy affecting an entire industry sector if you have stock holdings in one of the companies in the industry sector). [Ethics Rules at p. 2 (Attachment S) (emphasis in original).]

Other PTO ethic rules govern outside employment activities:

**General Rule on Outside Activities.** You may not engage in outside employment or any other personal activity that conflicts with your Department position, including employment that requires disqualification from a significant part of your Government duties or an activity that creates an appearance of using your public office for private gain. You must disqualify yourself from participating in a matter as a Department employee which may affect the financial interests of an outside employer or in which an outside employer, or an organization in which you are an

active participant, is a party or is representing a party. . . . [Ethics Rules at p. 5 (Attachment S) (emphasis in original).]

These restrictions against financial conflicts of interest and outside employment activities are further amplified with specific reference to patent examiners in the following rules:

### **Financial conflicts of Interest**

Conflicts of Interests regarding Patent Examiners If you are a patent examiner, you may not participate in the review of any patent if you have a financial interest in a company that may be affected by the issuance or denial of the patent (unless your interest is in publicly-traded stock valued at \$5,000 or less in all affected companies). . . . [Ethics Rules at p. 10 (Attachment S).]

### **Outside Employment and Activities**

Service with Non-Federal organizations If you serve as an officer or director of an outside organization, such as a professional association, you may not participate as a USPTO employee on any matter that is likely to affect the financial interests of the organization. This may preclude you from serving with organizations that are active in matters before your office. If it would benefit USPTO to have an official relationship with a private organization, you may be assigned as a liaison to the organization, in which case your service with the organization would be in an official capacity, rather than as an outside activity. However, you may not be assigned to service in an official capacity as an officer or director of a non-Federal organization (other than a standards-setting body). [Ethics Rules at p. 11-12 (Attachment S) (emphasis in original).]

The applicability of these ethics rules to the present situation cannot be seriously disputed. Dr. Souw was employed as a PTO Examiner at the same time he admits to working as the lead scientist for BMS with an apparent ownership stake in the company, which has a competing interest with BlackLight. Indeed, records indicate that Dr. Souw was a PTO employee prior to the date *Optical Engineering* first received his BMS article on February 6, 2003, and throughout the time that paper was being revised and received on May 6, 2003, and ultimately published on November 2, 2003.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> See, for example, U.S. Patent No. 6,506,648, issued January 14, 2003, which identifies Bernard Souw as the Assistant Examiner. Based on established PTO procedures, Examiner Souw is believed to have been a PTO employee when the Notice of Allowance was issued in that case, well before January 2003.

The article's May 6, 2003 revision date is particularly significant. It was only one day later, on May 7, 2003, that the Committee began issuing rejections in BlackLight's pending cases based on Appendices authored by Dr. Souw, starting with the '768 application. Dr. Souw's genuine conflict of interest in working for BMS during his employ as a PTO examiner—and while rejecting a competitor's patent applications no less—should be obvious to any fair-minded person and, thus, requires no further discussion.<sup>130</sup>

This clear conflict of interest is especially troubling given the many other questionable activities that have occurred in the prosecution of BlackLight's applications as documented and described above, including:

- (1) the withdrawal from issue of five allowed BlackLight applications under highly suspicious circumstances involving interference by Dr. Robert Park, spokesman for the American Physical Society (APS), a BlackLight competitor;
- (2) the admission by Dr. Park's APS colleague, Dr. Peter Zimmerman, that Dr. Park has a "Deep Throat" contact at the Patent Office who has provided him with information concerning BlackLight applications;
- (3) the rejection of Applicant's claims based on a non-peer reviewed article posted on an Internet bulletin board authored by Dr. Zimmerman, who has bragged that while working at the State

---

<sup>130</sup> Interestingly, Dr. Souw mentions in his article that he co-founded BMS in 1993 while working for BNL and that he left BNL in 1997 to join the PTO, apparently while still operating BMS. According to the article, Dr. Souw then left the PTO in 2000 to join ITT Industries as a scientist/engineer in the optical communications field until 2002, when he left "to dedicate more time as lead scientist with BMS Enterprise." [Emphasis added.] Notably, however, Dr. Souw fails to mention in the BMS article his apparent re-employment by the PTO, which failure, incidentally, does comply with at least one PTO ethics rule: "you may not use your Government title in connection with a non-Government activity." [[Ethics Rules at p. 7 (Attachment S) (emphasis in original).]

Also somewhat troubling is that Dr. Souw apparently continues to examine and issue applications in other art areas that overlap with his scientific work for BMS, including optical communications, which is the subject matter of his published article. [See, e.g., U.S. Patent No. 6,801,676, filed June 24, 2003 and issued October 5, 2004, on a "Method and apparatus for phase shifting an optical beam in an optical device with a buffer plug" (recognizing in the "Background of the Invention" section that "the need for fast and efficient optical-based technologies is increasing as Internet data traffic growth rate is overtaking voice traffic pushing the need for optical communications.")]



Department his agency and the Patent Office "have fought back with success" against BlackLight;

- (4) Dr. Zimmerman's improper contact of scientific journals in an attempt to prevent Applicant from meeting the publication requirement imposed by the Committee before his experimental evidence would even be considered; and
- (5) Examiner Wayne Langel's untimely resignation from the examination of BlackLight's applications for "moral and ethical reasons" after being told to materially misrepresent the record and that "allowance is not an option" in these cases.

In view of this sordid prosecution history, Applicant is understandably outraged by the discovery that following Examiner Langel's unfortunate resignation, the Committee appointed Dr. Souw to continue carrying out its "allowance is not an option" policy while he owned and operated a competing business interest. Applicant has demanded several times that the PTO provide a complete accounting of the facts and circumstances surrounding prior questionable activities, including those summarized above. Applicant has made a similar demand for information in connection with this latest episode involving Dr. Souw's conflicted association with BMS while assigned to examine and reject BlackLight's pending patent applications. Applicant now repeats that demand for information here, including but not limited to a full disclosure of the facts and circumstances relating to:

- (1) Dr. Souw's appointment as an examiner assigned to review BlackLight's pending patent applications;
- (2) his outside business activities with BMS Enterprise, and with any other business ventures in which he has a financial stake or other personal interest;
- (3) his contacts with any sources outside the PTO regarding the subject matter disclosed in any of BlackLight's applications; and

(4) his membership activities, or any other participation, in any professional organizations, including the APS.<sup>131</sup>

Unfortunately, like Applicant's many other reasonable information requests, this one too has been ignored by the Committee despite the serious implications of Dr. Souw's outside business activities in establishing a genuine conflict with his examination of BlackLight's pending cases. The Committee's repeated refusals to honor these requests, however, merely raise further suspicion that it is withholding information that would reinforce Applicant's already strong showing of a conflict in those cases.

When not withholding information, the Committee tries to obscure the facts by advancing irrelevant and inaccurate information that contradicts Dr. Souw's own admissions:

Applicant's remarks concerning examiner Souw, and the article (Attachment S) are noted. This article deals with a telescope array, and does not appear to show any conflict of interest between Dr. Souw's former employer, BMS Enterprise, and his consulting involvement with the present application. [See, e.g., December 21, 2004 Advisory Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/362,693 at p. 2 (emphasis added).]

The Committee's carefully worded denial of Dr. Souw's obvious genuine conflict of interest only raised further suspicions by its failure to even address Applicant's basis for asserting the conflict. While the Committee claims to have noted Applicant's remarks regarding this issue, it is apparent from its initial brief response that, true to

---

<sup>131</sup> This information is deemed relevant to the following additional PTO ethics rule:

**Appearances of Bias (non-Financial Conflicts of Interest)**

Participation in Professional Organizations If you are an active member of a professional organization, such as a member of a[n] association of attorneys or patent professionals, you will be barred from participating in USPTO on matters in which that organization is a party or is representing a party. If this will interfere with your USPTO duties, you should refrain from such activities or should seek advice from the Ethics Division. . . . [PTO Ethics Rules at p. 10 (Attachment S).]

As explained in detail above, and in previous Responses, Applicant has good reason to believe that the APS, and perhaps other professional organizations, have become involved as active participants in these proceedings.

form, those remarks were wholly ignored.

The Committee's refusal to seriously address the conflict in this case is clear from its narrow focus on the subject matter of the Souw article. Although the Committee correctly notes that the article "deals with a telescope array," that fact is totally irrelevant and, thus, cannot possibly support the Committee's conclusion that the article "does not appear to show any conflict of interest." [Emphasis added.]

Applicant has never relied on the subject matter of Dr. Souw's article as a basis for establishing a conflict in the present application. Rather, as previously discussed, that showing is based upon Dr. Souw's admission in the background summary of the article that he co-founded BMS Enterprise and has continued to operate the company as its lead scientist.<sup>132</sup> In that capacity, he works in two main technical areas—microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis and applications—identical to those practiced by Applicant while also employed by the PTO to examine and reject Applicant's cases. The Committee's initial refusal to even acknowledge that aspect of Applicant's showing of a genuine conflict of interest in this case, much less discuss it, is telling and only confirms Applicant's showing that a conflict does indeed exist.

The Committee attempts to gloss over Dr. Souw's startling admission that he operates a business enterprise that competes with Applicant's business interests while examining his cases by claiming that the subject matter of the article, i.e., a telescope array, does not establish a conflict of interest "between Dr. Souw's former employer, BMS Enterprise, and his consulting involvement with the present application."

[Emphasis added.] Aside from being non-responsive, this argument is also factually inaccurate and only further confirms that a conflict of interest does indeed exist.

The Committee incorrectly refers to BMS as a "former employer," in contradiction to Dr. Souw's admissions that he co-founded BMS and, therefore, is presumably a principal owner of the company, and that he continues to operate the company while employed by the PTO as an Examiner. The Committee merely compounded its error

---

<sup>132</sup> As footnoted above, Applicant's only reference to a conflict involving the subject matter of Dr. Souw's article, i.e. optical communications, revolves around his continued examination of other patent applicants' cases in that same art. This pattern of ignoring conflicts merely provides further support for, but does not form the basis of, Applicant's clear showing that Dr. Souw is also conflicted in this case based on his ongoing work for BMS, as disclosed in the article's background summary.

based on the alleged "former employer" status of BMS with the unfounded conclusion that no conflict of interest exists between Dr. Souw's work for BMS as its lead scientist and his work for the PTO as the Examiner primarily responsible for examining Applicant's cases. In drawing this erroneous conclusion, the Committee all but admits the obvious—that Dr. Souw's current employment with BMS does in fact create a genuine conflict of interest, which then taints the Committee's rejections in those cases.

Perhaps realizing the incoherence of its initial response regarding the issue of Dr. Souw's apparent conflict of interest, the Committee, in a subsequent Office Action, drastically changed its position. Although the Committee no longer tries to mischaracterize BMS as a "former employer," astonishingly, it now argues that Dr. Souw's continued operation of that company while he examined and rejected Applicant's patent applications does not create a conflict:

Applicant also implies (page 108) that Dr. Bernard Souw, who has been consulted during the examination of his applications, is also involved in work "competitive" to this [sic] own, which would produce a conflict of interest. The evidence offered by applicant, an article written by Dr. Souw, deals with a telescope array, which is neither an alternative form of hydrogen nor a new previously unappreciated source of energy, and thus does not appear to be competitive with the present "hydrino" or any battery based thereon. While the biographical sketch at the end of the article mentions his involvement in consulting work having to do with microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis, this would not amount to competition with the present invention or the underlying hydrinos. Diamonds are a form of carbon, and thus are not in competition with hydrogen. Microwave plasma devices are not necessarily related to hydrogen, since they are a type of device or machine. [2/11/05 Office Action at page 4 filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/110,717.]

These arguments, which attempt to downplay Dr. Souw's conflicting business activities, are no more convincing than those previously posited and, in fact, raise so many new issues, Applicant hardly knows where to begin. First, Applicant did not "imply" anything; rather, he simply quoted relevant portions of Dr. Souw's own article admitting to outside business activities that clearly conflict with technologies practiced by Applicant whose pending patent applications Dr. Souw has examined and rejected. That alone is sufficient to establish a genuine conflict of interest that fatally taints the biased views of Dr. Souw adopted by the Committee.

Second, the Committee's comment regarding "the evidence offered by Applicant" is disturbing. It is not Applicant's responsibility to "offer" evidence that the Committee itself should have produced voluntarily. Worse yet, the Committee continues to withhold additional evidence in its sole possession responsive to Applicant's information requests regarding Dr. Souw's outside business interests, which evidence would likely shed further light on the conflict issue. If and when the Committee chooses to cooperate with Applicant by turning over the requested information, there is no telling what additional genuine conflicts of interest will be revealed based on "the evidence offered by Applicant."

Third, as previously discussed, the Committee's reliance on the subject matter of the article, i.e., a telescope array, is a "red herring" that has absolutely nothing to do with the conflict issues surrounding Dr. Souw's questionable business activities. Applicant has never once asserted that Dr. Souw's work in the area of telescope arrays creates a genuine conflict of interest in this case. For the Committee to continue to raise this as an issue merely highlights the weakness of its position denying the existence of a conflict.

Fourth, the Committee uses strained reasoning in asserting that Dr. Souw's admission to his involvement in consulting work relating to microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis "would not amount to competition with the present invention or the underlying hydrinos." As explained above, and in other numerous responses, one direct application of the BlackLight's lower-energy hydrogen technology is CVD diamond synthesis, which subject is covered by claims in one of its pending patent applications. For the Committee to ignore this plain, simple fact and weakly argue instead that "[d]iamonds are a form of carbon, and thus are not in competition with hydrogen" merely demonstrates its refusal to take the conflict issue seriously. Similarly, the Committee's excuse that "microwave plasma devices are not necessarily related to hydrogen, since they are a type of device or machine" hardly merits a response. Again, the formation of microwave plasmas is a direct application of BlackLight's lower-energy hydrogen technology as Dr. Souw himself has recognized, and is covered in its pending patent applications. Dr. Souw has recognized as much by advocating that his prior work experience provides evidence of his "strong background

in microwave plasmas generated in a resonance cavity similar to those used by Applicant.” [See, for example, Souw Appendix at p. 4 attached to the March 29, 2004 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No 09/513,768.] Dr. Souw's statement regarding his decades-old work in the field of microwave plasmas applies equally to his work today in that same field for BMS, yet, mysteriously, Dr. Souw and the Committee have tried their best to keep that experience secret. Why? The Committee's failure to address these and other salient points establishing a conflict of interest only strengthens Applicant's case.

Fifth and finally, the PTO members of the Committee know better than anyone that direct competition between the Examiner and the Applicant whose case he is examining is not the proper standard used in determining whether a conflict of interest exists. Indeed, the PTO's own Ethics Rules, as discussed above, forbid an Examiner from engaging in outside employment activities that create even the appearance of impropriety:

**General Rule on Outside Activities.** You may not engage in outside employment or any other personal activity that conflicts with your Department position, including employment that requires disqualification from a significant part of your Government duties or an activity that creates an appearance of using your public office for private gain. . . . [Ethics Rules at p. 5 (Attachment S) (emphasis in original).]

Incredibly, after initially withholding information about Dr. Souw's outside business activities, and then trying to pass him off as a former BMS employee, the Committee once again contradicts itself in a subsequently filed Office Action begrudgingly admitting that Dr. Souw, in fact, owns the company and, therefore, “may appear to have a conflict of interest.” In making that admission, however, the Committee continues to blatantly disregard the PTO's own Ethics Rules in contending that this appearance of impropriety does not prevent Dr. Souw from examining Applicant's patent cases based on the absurd argument that he does not work on fuel cells in direct competition with Applicant:

Applicant argues . . . that examiner Bernard Souw owns a company which provides consulting services in two technical areas, microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis. While an examiner with such

outside employment may appear to have a conflict of interest, such a conflict can be avoided if he refrains from either working on applications dealing with these, or working on these things in his outside employment. The present application, however, is drawn to a fuel cell, which is outside those fields, and thus would not be in competition with any consultation therein. [Final Office Action dated July 18, 2005 issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/008,947.]

Like the Committee's previous attempts to cover up Dr. Souw's obvious conflict of interest, this one too must fail. Simply put, the presence or absence of direct competition is not the standard by which conflict of interest issues are to be judged. As noted above, the admitted appearance of a conflict is alone sufficient to disqualify Dr. Souw as an examiner in this case and exclude his biased arguments.

In any case, the Committee further admits by its own arguments that Dr. Souw's work for BMS on microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis overlaps with BlackLight's business interests and, therefore, denying BlackLight its patents, including one in this case, works to Dr. Souw's economic benefit. Contrary to the Committee's misguided view of the rules on ethics, such a conflict is not avoided by Dr. Souw's alleged non-competition in the narrowly drawn field of fuel cells.

Applicant suspects that the Committee's self-serving statements quoted above are narrowly confined to avoid disclosing the full scope of Dr. Souw's outside business activities, which information Applicant has repeatedly requested for years now without the courtesy of a response. The Committee, however, has no basis for asserting that Dr. Souw's outside business activities are limited to his work on microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis. Applicant knows for a fact that these are not the only two technical fields Dr. Souw engages in for BMS, as he himself admits in the background section of the journal article unearthed by Applicant's counsel:

[Dr. Souw] cofounded BMS Enterprise, a multi-/interdisciplinary consulting company providing services mainly [i.e., not exclusively] in microwave plasma devices and CVD diamond synthesis and applications. [Souw, Bernard Eng-Kie, Coherent telescope array with self-homodyne interferometric detection for optical communications, Opt. Eng. 42(1) at 3157 (November 2003) (Attachment S) (emphasis and explanatory note in brackets added).]

That statement makes clear that there are other technical fields in which Dr. Souw provides services through his work for BMS. The Committee's refusal to disclose this important relevant information only fuels further suspicion that Dr. Souw is secretly engaged in other technologies that conflict with those practiced by Applicant.

Applicant is also suspicious of the Committee's carefully worded statement regarding Dr. Souw's work in the fields of microwave plasmas and CVD diamond synthesis and that Applicant's '947 application is "drawn to a fuel cell, which is outside those fields, and thus would not be in competition with any consultation therein." That statement is not an affirmative declaration that Dr. Souw has refrained from working in other technical fields that may also be common to those applications he has examined or otherwise provided input.<sup>133</sup>

The Committee's tenuous position in this regard is also shot down by Dr. Souw himself through his own incriminating statements. For example, before counsel's independent investigation uncovered Dr. Souw's conflicting business activities for BMS, Dr. Souw proudly touted his supposed "strong background in microwave plasmas" based on his prior work experience. According to Dr. Souw, that experience was highly relevant to his qualifications for examining the subject matter of Applicant's pending cases:

In the contrary, such technical papers provide a solid evidence that the Examiner is in possession of sufficient background for evaluating Applicant's claimed invention. In this regard, the Examiner can add a further evidence of strong background in microwave plasmas generated in a resonance cavity similar to those used by Applicant, not only in theory, but also hands-on in its design, construction and routine operation, as well as in its spectroscopy, both low and high resolutions [1]. [Souw Appendix at p. 4 attached to the March 29, 2004 Office Action filed in the '768 application.]

By Dr. Souw's own admission, his present clandestine work for BMS then also provides further evidence of his strong background in microwave plasmas similar to those used by Applicant, thus raising a genuine conflict of interest. For the Committee to limit discussion of the relevant subject matter of Applicant's cases to "fuel cells," or any other

---

<sup>133</sup> Of course, once a conflict of interest has been established in even one of Applicant's cases, that is a sufficient showing that Dr. Souw's bias has infected all of Applicant's cases in which his views appear.



technical field supposedly outside the scope of Dr. Souw's business activities—such as plasmas, for example—is simply nonsensical.

In apparent recognition of the weakness of its prior arguments denying a conflict, the Committee again tries to defend the indefensible by taking new positions in a subsequent Office Action. [See, e.g., September 9, 2005 Office Action filed in App'n Ser. No. 09/362,693; December 12, 2005 Advisory Action filed in App'n Ser. No. 09/110,694] The Committee, however, succeeds only in contradicting itself once again, most notably by recognizing the operability of BlackLight's novel hydrogen technology, which involves the use of hydrinos, as a basis for distinguishing Dr. Souw's work for BMS:

Applicant alleges a conflict of interest on the part of Dr. Bernard Souw, who has authored Appendices, and has been consulted during the examination of the present application, since Dr. Souw's consulting firm, BMS, would be a competitor of applicant's company, Blacklight. Applicant only shows that BMS has done consulting work in two fields in which applicant believes his invention to be applicable. However, these fields are microwave plasmas and CVD analysis, which do not necessarily require the use of hydrinos, while applicant's invention (in the present application) deal with methods of making compounds that include hydrinos, which do not use microwave plasmas or CVD. Even if these were competing fields, Dr. Souw would have the option of either withdrawing from working on the present application, or refraining from working on the competing subject matter outside of the PTO. [September 9, 2005 Office Action filed App'n Ser. No. 09/362,693 at p. 4; December 12, 2005 Advisory Action filed App'n Ser. No. 09/110,694 at pp. 3-4 (emphasis added).]

Having been forced to recognize the operability of BlackLight's novel hydrogen technology based on the required use of hydrinos to distinguish it from Dr. Souw's work for BMS in attempting to avoid a conflict of interest,<sup>134</sup> the Committee is obliged to withdraw its rejections of Applicant's claims under § 101 and § 112. Should it otherwise maintain those rejections on the basis that hydrinos do not exist, the Committee must then concede by its latest arguments that Dr. Souw's clandestine work for BMS is not sufficiently distinguishable from Applicant's hydrogen technology to avoid a conflict.

---

<sup>134</sup> That is not to say that the Committee necessarily avoids a conflict of interest based on Dr. Souw's work involving the same technical subject matter as that of Applicant.

The Committee's reliance on the existence of hydrinos to avoid Applicant's conflict of interest charge, while appreciated, once again ignores the broad grounds upon which that charge was based. The Committee notably still fails to address the obvious economic benefit to Dr. Souw through BMS in denying BlackLight its patents on related technology and the Committee's duty to avoid even the appearance of impropriety under the PTO's Ethics Rules. In essence, the Committee is arguing that, for there to be a conflict of interest in this case, Dr. Souw's outside business activities would have to infringe patent claims he is assigned to examine were those claims to issue. That is clearly not the proper standard for evaluating whether or not a conflict of interest exists.

The Committee's arguments denying a conflict of interest in this case are noteworthy in two other significant respects. First, its argument that Dr. Souw's work for BMS in the fields of microwave plasmas and CVD analysis "do not necessarily require the use of hydrinos" leaves open the possibility that these fields may in fact involve BMS's use of hydrinos in some capacity. Of course, Applicant may never know due to the Committee's continued refusal to respond to Applicant's reasonable request to fully disclose the extent of Dr. Souw's improper business activities.

Second, the Committee's argument that "Applicant only shows that BMS has done consulting work in two fields in which applicant believes his invention to be applicable" completely disregards the fact that these two fields practiced by BMS and BlackLight reflect a significant technological overlap between the two companies. As previously noted, the Committee also overlooks Dr. Souw's own admission of his "strong background in microwave plasmas generated in a resonance cavity similar to those used by Applicant," which experience also describes his clandestine work for BMS. Further, in criticizing Applicant for what he "only shows," the Committee again unfairly places the burden on Applicant to produce information regarding the scope of Dr. Souw's work for BMS that remains in the Committee's sole possession despite Applicant's repeated requests for that information.

Were it not for the diligence of Applicant in investigating Dr. Souw's questionable business activities, Dr. Souw would have forever kept his work for BMS a secret. Indeed, the Committee was so reluctant to disclose this information after Applicant first

uncovered it that the Committee tried to pass off BMS as Dr. Souw's former employer to avoid a conflict. Having now admitted that Dr. Souw continues in his role as lead scientist for BMS while examining BlackLight's applications, it is even more critical that the Committee stop stonewalling Applicant's information requests seeking the full extent of Dr. Souw's clandestine business activities.

Notwithstanding the Committee's refusal to cooperate, Applicant believes he has gathered sufficient evidence to establish a genuine conflict of interest for all the reasons previously stated. The Committee acknowledges as much by its further strained argument that the conflict can simply be erased because Dr. Souw has the "option of either withdrawing from working on the present application, or refraining from working [for BMS] on the competing subject matter outside of the PTO."<sup>135</sup> The Committee could not be more wrong on this point. Inasmuch as Dr. Souw has already "poisoned the well" with his biased views, it is ridiculous to now suggest that Dr. Souw can somehow inoculate himself from conflict charges by having the mere option of discontinuing his role as lead examiner for the Committee or lead scientist for BMS on the competing subject matter. Applicant has already been severely harmed by a conflict of interest that the Committee has all but admitted, and it is incomprehensible how the Committee's so-called "option" can possibly undo that damage.

Of course, once the Committee comes clean with a full disclosure of all of Dr. Souw's outside business activities, his contacts with outside sources regarding Applicant's technology, and his involvement with any professional organizations, as requested above, other conflicts may also emerge and Applicant anxiously awaits that information.<sup>136</sup> In the meantime, the Committee only adds to the injustice perpetrated against Applicant by maintaining the rejections of record, which have been contaminated by Dr. Souw's biased views. Applicant once again strenuously protests this unfair treatment and demands that the

---

<sup>135</sup> Not surprisingly, the Committee is noticeably silent as to whether Dr. Souw intends to exercise one of those so-called "options"—not that it matters, since the damage caused by Dr. Souw's biased views has already been done and neither option can possibly repair that damage.

<sup>136</sup> As previously noted, Applicant disputes the Committee's suggestion that it is his burden to uncover and produce this vital information. Nonetheless, Applicant is continuing to investigate these matters and will provide additional relevant information concerning Dr. Souw's questionable activities as it becomes available.

rejections in the present application be withdrawn immediately so that this case can finally be allowed to issue.

**Dr. Souw's Biased Views Adopted by the Committee  
are Further Demonstrated by Citation to His Own Work**

The genuine conflict of interest surrounding the questionable business activities of Dr. Souw is not the only source of bias he brings to this case. Dr. Souw also demonstrates extreme bias by citing two of his own technical papers published in the journal *Physica* to support the rejection of Applicant's claims on theoretical grounds.<sup>137</sup> This procedural miscue is inherently unfair for two obvious reasons.

First, the Committee fails to show that the journals in which Dr. Souw's technical papers appear are any more "scientifically qualified" with the appropriate review process than the journals that published Applicant's papers. Yet the Committee gives Dr. Souw's papers the "credibility that peer-reviewed articles have," while refusing to bestow that same credibility on Applicant's peer-reviewed journal articles. [See, for example, page 5 of the Committee's May 19, 2004 Office Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/362,693.] The Committee's reliance on Dr. Souw's papers merely illustrates an obvious double standard and demonstrates once again its bias against Applicant in failing to fairly consider his experimental evidence published in prestigious journals as scientifically qualified, which evidence far outweighs the scant evidence produced by Dr. Souw.

When Applicant previously pointed out that this double standard is but another example of the Committee's arbitrary and capricious handling of Applicant's cases, the Committee responded with an even more contorted argument confirming as much:

Applicant argues (page 126) that many of his cited articles "have in fact passed the peer-review process" (emphasis applicant's). The fact that some may have passed this process does not nullify the fact that others have not. The failure to pass or undergo peer review is only one reason why applicant's evidence is unpersuasive. [See, for example,

---

<sup>137</sup> Dr. Souw's extreme bias against Applicant is further demonstrated by his many outlandish statements adopted by the Committee, such as his comment equating Applicant's sophisticated hydrogen technology with "crop circles"! [See, e.g., the May 12, 2005 Advisory Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877.]

page 5 of the Committee's November 21, 2005 Office Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/110,678.]

This latest argument only further exposes the hypocrisy of the Committee's inconsistent positions. Applicant published his confidential data in peer-reviewed journal articles after the Committee required him to do so. Then, when Applicant pointed out that the Committee improperly discounted this evidence as not having been published in peer-reviewed articles, while attributing enhanced credibility to Dr. Souw's peer-reviewed articles that it relied upon, the Committee responds by arbitrarily rejecting Applicant's published evidence anyway simply because other evidence has not yet been published.<sup>138</sup> Unable to put forward a convincing argument based on that novel evidentiary standard, the Committee arbitrarily concocts yet another one in asserting that the journals that have peer reviewed and published Applicant's scientific evidence are not sufficiently "mainstream" to be given credible weight, a specious argument if there ever was one. [See, e.g., the Committee's September 29, 2005 Office Action at p. 19 filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877.] Again, the Committee, by advancing such inane arguments, succeeds only in proving Applicant's point that it has denied him a fair and expeditious hearing on his scientific evidence.

The second reason that the Committee's reliance on the views of Dr. Souw based on citation of his own technical papers against Applicant is inherently unfair is because Dr. Souw can no longer be viewed as an impartial judge. How can the Examiner claim to be unbiased in response to arguments criticizing his own technical papers? The answer is obvious: he can't.

In any case, now that the Committee has relied upon Dr. Souw's own scientific research to support its rejections, Applicant is entitled to know from the Committee certain details of the Examiner's background, including a complete disclosure of his technical education and past work experiences. The Committee's steadfast refusal to disclose that relevant information provides a further basis for overturning its rejections.

---

<sup>138</sup> As previously noted, despite interference by Dr. Zimmerman—and perhaps by Dr. Park as well—in contacting various journals urging them not to publish Applicant's work, Applicant has been extremely successful in getting his articles published. Since the PTO is relying on the results of the activities of Dr. Zimmerman and/or Dr. Park denying publication of some of Applicant's articles, their involvement and interference in the prosecution of Applicant's pending applications is all the more relevant.

In a previous Office Action, the Committee tried, but failed, to rationalize why Dr. Souw should be allowed to cite without scrutiny his own technical papers against Applicant:

Applicant note[s] the involvement of Examiner Bernard Souw in the examination of another of his applications, and that Examiner Souw had previously worked for Brookhaven National Labs. Two things are thus pointed out. First, examiners are allowed, and even encouraged, to consult other examiners on matters of science. Dr. Souw is the author of the attached Appendix. While originally written for Serial No. 09/513,768, the Appendix is considered relevant to the present application for reasons stated below. Second, the employment history of examiners, including those acting in a consulting role, is irrelevant to the examination thereof, except where there is a genuine conflict of interest. [See April 14, 2004 Office Action at p. 4 in U.S. App'n. Ser. No. 09/008,947.]

The first point—that the PTO generally encourages consultation with other Examiners—is not even in dispute and is therefore irrelevant. The present objection to the Committee's consultation of Dr. Souw is his obvious bias in citing papers he authored, which requires that he critically analyze and respond to criticisms of his own work.

The Committee's second point—that the employment history of Examiners is only relevant when there is a "genuine conflict of interest"—is a backward standard that defies common sense.<sup>139</sup> As Applicant aptly demonstrated above, it was only after the Committee forced him to conduct an independent investigation into Dr. Souw's relevant employment history, by improperly withholding that information, that Applicant was then able to demonstrate the existence of a genuine conflict in this case. It would have been impossible to demonstrate that conflict had Applicant not first learned of the Examiner's relevant employment history involving his ongoing ownership and operation of BMS. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the Committee would like to keep from Applicant other relevant information that may strengthen his case.

---

<sup>139</sup> Applicant disputes that a genuine conflict of interest is actually necessary to show bias—even the appearance of a conflict should be sufficient to taint the views expressed by Dr. Souw. This point is moot, however, since genuine conflicts of interest based on Dr. Souw's outside business activities have been shown, which conflicts have fatally infected Dr. Souw's biased views adopted by the Committee.

In any event, now that Applicant has satisfied the Committee's "genuine conflict of interest" requirement, the Committee is obligated under its own backward standard to disclose the complete nature and scope of Dr. Souw's employment history so that a full determination can be made regarding the existence of other such conflicts.

**Dr. Souw's Biased Views Adopted by the  
Committee Are Further Damaged by His  
Reliance on the Fraud Perpetuated by Dr. Rathke**

Applicant has cited numerous examples in the preceding pages that demonstrate the extreme hostility exhibited by the Secret Committee and its most prominent member, Examiner/BMS President Souw, raising serious questions concerning the Committee's ability to fairly evaluate Applicant's claimed invention that only weaken its case. The Committee, however, has taken its extremism to a whole new level by adopting the conflicted views of Dr. Souw who now relies on dubious "evidence," including an article written by Dr. Andreas Rathke criticizing Applicant's theory as flawed by fraudulently misrepresenting mathematical equations underlying that theory. [See, e.g., the September 29, 2005 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877, and November 14, 2005 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/813,792.]

As Applicant has pointed out on numerous occasions—without even the slightest acknowledgment from Examiner/BMS President Souw—Dr. Rathke's critique is based on a misrepresentation of Applicant's theory in which he changed mathematical signs in Equations (1) and (9). In so doing, Dr. Rathke effectively fabricated new equations, which he then proceeded to "debunk" in his article. By fraudulently passing off his own debunked equations as Applicant's, Dr. Rathke has exposed himself as nothing more than a typical "mouthpiece" for the APS who totally lacks credibility in the scientific community.

That alone would be cause for great concern. Far more troubling, however, is the complicity demonstrated by the Committee and its conflicted lead Examiner, BMS President Souw, in placing its stamp of approval on the fraud perpetrated by Dr. Rathke in his article. Despite Applicant's repeated warnings against taking that extreme position, the Committee has refused to heed those warnings. [See, e.g., the

Committee's September 29, 2005 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877 ("Andreas Rathke of the European Space Agency (ESA) has published an article entitled "A critical analysis of the hydrino model" in the New Journal of Physics (vol. 7 (2005) 127) and the article **reaches the same conclusion** as set forth by the examiner that the applicant's CQM is mathematically and scientifically flawed and does not predict the existence of hydrino states.") (Emphasis added.)]

Indeed, after being advised of Dr. Rathke's fraudulent analysis, Dr. Souw has not only refused to disavow it, but rather, has embraced that analysis even more vigorously, essentially adopting it as his own:

A. Rathke, "A critical analysis of the hydrino model", New Journal of Physics, Vo.7 (2005) page 127, prov[es] that Applicant's electron wave function  $\rho$  in the form of  $\delta$  function (Rathke's Eq.5-7) is not at all a solution of the corresponding wave equation (Rathke's Eq.1). **Rathke's result is essentially the same as the Examiner's Appendix** (towards the end of section 4), reciting "*rigorously performing all mathematical operations, it comes out that Applicant's wave function  $p(r,t)$  is NOT at all a solution of Eq. 1.1 as claimed by Applicant throughout his hydrino hypothesis. That Applicant's  $p(r,t)$  is neither a solution of the Schrodinger equation is too obvious, since it does not contain the electron mass*". [November 14, 2005 Office Action filed in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/813,792 at 12 (emphasis added).]

By admitting that the results conveyed in Dr. Souw's Appendix is "essentially the same" as the fraudulent results discussed in Dr. Rathke's article, the Committee has discredited the entire basis for its own rejections in this case. The Committee's continued citation and reliance on that article merely perpetuates the fraud that Dr. Rathke initiated against Applicant and stands as a monumental embarrassment to the PTO.

Applicant further finds it incomprehensible that Applicant has had to publish his experimental evidence in peer-reviewed journal articles to be considered credible and to show acceptance by the scientific community, only to have the Committee ignore that evidence; yet the Committee is quick to rely on Dr. Rathke's fraudulent article and the biased views of Examiner/BMS President Souw, which so-called "evidence" no reputable member of the scientific community would accept.

In light of the awkward position the Committee now finds itself, Applicant



requests that it immediately suspend Dr. Souw from any further examination of this and all other BlackLight applications and that all rejections of record in these cases, which have been tainted by Dr. Rathke's fraudulent analysis, be withdrawn immediately so that Applicant's patents may be allowed to issue.

Should the Committee refuse to honor these requests despite the close correspondence between the Committee's analysis of Applicant's theory and Dr. Rathke's fraudulent analysis, Applicant further requests that the Committee provide any and all information relating to: (1) communications between the PTO and either Dr. Rathke or other persons with regard to Dr. Rathke or his fraudulent analysis of Applicant's theory; and (2) activities or other involvement by Dr. Rathke or others that led the Committee to adopt Dr. Rathke's fraudulent analysis.

**Further Confirmation of the Committee's "Allowance is Not an Option" Policy and Its Refusal to Grant Applicant a Fair and Expeditious Hearing**

**Examiner Wayner Confirmed the Committee's Official Policy Not to Allow Applicant's Cases**

As discussed above, Examiner Langel initially advised Applicant that a Committee of PTO officials he could not identify was responsible for authoring the Office Actions he was instructed to sign as the named Examiner of record in the cases assigned to him. Examiner Kalafut later confirmed that he was also merely the named Examiner of record and that he too did not author the Office Actions issued by the Committee in his cases. Given that these two senior PTO employees, having over 50 years of experience between them, were being used as Examiners-in-name-only by this "Secret Committee," Applicant found it odd that another named Examiner, William Wayner, would make the following statement in another BlackLight application to which he was assigned:

For the record this Examiner makes it clear that there is no committee in charge of this application, that all of the office actions in this case have been done by me alone an[d] that I have never been told that I could not allow this application. [See April 26, 2004 Office Action issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/181,180 ('180 application).]

Applicant's initial doubt regarding the veracity of that statement was confirmed in an initial telephone conversation held on October 5, 2004, between Applicant's counsel, Jeffrey A. Simenauer, and Mr. Wayner, following his retirement from the PTO as an Examiner, and in a follow-up telephone conversation held on October 25, 2004.

Sometime in mid-September, Mr. Wayner had called and left Mr. Simenauer, a former PTO colleague, a telephone message informing him of his retirement and his desire to secure patent search work to do in his spare time. Mr. Simenauer returned Mr. Wayner's call and spoke to him on October 5<sup>th</sup> about doing some possible work, after which the conversation turned to Mr. Wayner's involvement in the examination of the '180 application. The substance of that conversation was confirmed in an e-mail Mr. Simenauer sent to Mr. Wayner on October 15, 2004. [See Attachment S.]

During the October 5 phone conversation, Mr. Wayner was very candid in complimenting Dr. Mills for the way he had handled himself during the February 11, 2003 Interview, commenting that "Mills is one hell of a persuasive man" and that "he came across as very convincing" at the Interview. In his October 15 e-mail, Mr. Simenauer thanked Mr. Wayner for those comments, which he indicated had been forwarded to Dr. Mills.

Mr. Simenauer then told Mr. Wayner that, while he disagreed with the positions Mr. Wayner had expressed during the Interview, including his skepticism regarding the operability of Mills' invention, he still respected those views. Mr. Simenauer, however, made clear to Mr. Wayner that what really upset him were the questionable actions that the PTO has taken against BlackLight prejudicing its patent rights. In that regard, Mr. Simenauer recalled Examiner Langel's resignation from examining Applicant's cases "for moral and ethical reasons" due to instructions he had been given to misrepresent the record to promote the PTO's "allowance is not an option" policy. Specifically, Mr. Simenauer reminded Mr. Wayner of how Examiner Langel was told to say that he was against allowing Dr. Mills' applications, when in fact he favored doing so, and that he had authority to issue Dr. Mills his patents, when he clearly had no such authority.

Mr. Wayner confirmed this official position of the Patent Office "not to allow [Dr. Mills'] cases" and admitted that he could not tell Mr. Simenauer this while he was still

working at the PTO. As stated in his October 15 e-mail, Mr. Simenauer appreciated Mr. Wayner's honesty and understood why he had previously remained silent.

As further stated in his e-mail, Mr. Simenauer had first decided not to ask Mr. Wayner to go "on the record" with this information, given that Applicant already had a record of Examiner Langel's statements that the PTO had in place an "allowance is not an option" policy and that he was asked to misrepresent his authority to issue patents in BlackLight's cases. Mr. Simenauer mentioned, however, that a problem had arisen that had caused him to reconsider that decision. Mr. Simenauer explained that his review of Mr. Wayner's last Office Action in the '180 application had turned up the above-quoted statement that "I [Wayner] have never been told that I could not allow this application," which contradicted what Mr. Wayner had told Mr. Simenauer previously on the phone regarding his lack of authority to allow it.

In view of Examiner Langel's admission that he was told by senior PTO officials that he did not have authority to allow BlackLight's applications under any circumstances, but that he should give the false impression that he did have such authority, Mr. Simenauer expressed concern in his October 15 e-mail that the PTO might have put Mr. Wayner in a similar uncomfortable position when he stated that he had authority to allow the '180 application. Mr. Simenauer then informed Mr. Wayner that, as BlackLight's patent counsel, he was obligated to press the matter. Knowing Mr. Wayner to be "a man of utmost integrity," Mr. Simenauer further stated that he felt comfortable requesting "[his] assistance in simply uncovering the true facts regarding the PTO's policy decisions that have been made against BlackLight."

In response to Mr. Simenauer's e-mail, Mr. Wayner called him on October 25, 2004 and left a message, which call was then returned the same day by Mr. Simenauer and the undersigned co-counsel, Jeffrey S. Melcher. At no time during this subsequent telephone conversation did Mr. Wayner deny the substance of his earlier October 5<sup>th</sup> conversation with Mr. Simenauer as reflected in the October 15<sup>th</sup> e-mail. Rather, Mr. Wayner started the conversation by stating, "You should know better. I don't want to get involved in this anymore." Mr. Wayner further stated that he did not want to talk any further about the subjects discussed in Mr. Simenauer's confirmation e-mail and that, in his words, "you will have to go by what's on the record," making clear to Applicant's

counsel that he would not accept their request for assistance regarding the truth of his statements in the present Office Action.

Mr. Wayner also stated that while he wanted to continue his personal friendship with Mr. Simenauer, he also wanted "to stay out of the [BlackLight] case." Mr. Simenauer apologized for troubling him with this matter and informed Mr. Wayner that he may not be able to remain out of the BlackLight case against the PTO if it were to go to trial following an appeal to the PTO Board. Somewhat nervously, Wayner responded by stating that "it is a very dangerous situation" for him, and again made clear that he did not want to talk about it any further. Mr. Simenauer told Mr. Wayner that he understood and sympathized with his situation and that he did not want to put him in the uncomfortable position of having to say anything more on the subject.

Mr. Wayner then stated that he had changed his mind about seeking search work from Mr. Simenauer as he had initially requested since, in his words, "I don't want it to look like a *quid pro quo*." Again, Mr. Simenauer expressed his understanding of the situation Mr. Wayner found himself in and that ended the conversation.

In light of these unfortunate developments, Applicant must demand that the PTO Committee cease and desist from any further attempts to cloud the administrative record in his cases so as to make it appear that the "Examiners-in-name-only" are solely responsible for its actions. As with the situation involving instructions that led to Examiner Langel's resignation "for moral and ethical reasons," Applicant further demands that the Committee provide a complete account of the facts and circumstances that led to the questionable statements appearing in the Office Action signed by Examiner Wayner in the '180 application prior to his retirement.

**Examiner Tsang-Foster Has Confirmed the Committee's  
Refusal to Fairly Evaluate Applicant's Scientific Evidence**

The Committee's "allowance is not an option" policy has been further advanced by yet another Examiner, Susy N. Tsang-Foster.<sup>140</sup> Examiner Tsang-Foster basically

---

<sup>140</sup> Examiner Tsang-Foster's name and signature appear at the end of Office Actions in certain BlackLight applications. Like other Examiners, whose names have appeared in various BlackLight cases, but have admitted not being responsible for the content of the Committee's Office Actions, Examiner Tsang-Foster is also believed to be merely an Examiner-in-name-only.

admits to the Committee's continued refusal to grant Applicant a fair hearing on the mountain of scientific evidence, submitted at its request, proving the existence of lower energy states of hydrogen. [See, for example, the May 12, 2005 Advisory Action issued in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877.]<sup>141</sup>

With now over 65 peer-reviewed articles published in respected scientific journals—and the list keeps growing—Applicant has achieved acceptance in the scientific community, which was improperly required by the Committee as a condition for patentability in this case. Rather than fully and fairly evaluate Applicant's compelling experimental evidence, the Committee now takes the extreme position that all of this evidence "detract[s] from the central issue that the hydrino does not theoretically exist." [See May 12, 2005 Advisory Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877 at page 2 (emphasis added).] Out of the multitude of baseless arguments contrived by the Committee, this one truly stands out as perhaps the most outrageous.

Applicant has spent enormous amounts of effort and money complying with the PTO's arbitrary requirement that he publicly disclose his confidential data in peer-reviewed publications to prove the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. Now, incredibly, Applicant is being told that those efforts have been for naught since, according to the Committee, "all of applicant's data cannot prove what is not theoretically possible." [See May 12, 2005 Advisory Action in U.S. App'n Ser. No. 09/669,877 at page 2.] This statement is not only grossly erroneous, but it also contradicts the Committee's own prior statements. Indeed, in previous Office Actions, the Committee has responded to Applicant's criticism by vehemently denying that it was taking the position that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen was impossible. For

---

<sup>141</sup> The Committee created another procedural morass in that case when it issued the May 12, 2005 Advisory Action, which required Applicant's response to forty-four pages of new arguments and twenty-one newly cited references. It was bad enough that the Committee included these voluminous new arguments in an Advisory Action without extending Applicant the courtesy of withdrawing the finality of the April 22, 2004 Office Action and establishing a new time period for him to respond. The Committee only made the situation more onerous by mailing its Advisory Action on May 12, 2005, almost seven months after Applicant had responded to that Final Office Action on October 22, 2004, leaving Applicant less than ten days to respond.

Applicant attempted to correct this latest abuse of PTO procedures—effectively denying him a fair hearing—by requesting that a new time period be set. That request was initially ignored and then later denied without a satisfactory explanation.

instance, Committee-member Souw tried to claim:

Contrary to Applicant's allegation on pg. 13, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph, lines 2-4, the PTO's view is not at all that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen were impossible, but instead, that (a) Applicant's invention is not supported by any experimental fact or evidence, and (b) the underlying theory (i.e., GUT/CQM) fails to support the invention, because it contains too many flaws. [Souw Appendix at p. 3 attached to the Committee's Final Office Action mailed August 24, 2004 in Applicant's U.S. Ser. No. 08/467,051 (emphasis added).]

Such inconsistent positions permeate all of the Committee's Office Actions and provide further grounds for overturning the pending rejections.

As Applicant has consistently argued, the only way to settle the theoretical argument on whether lower-energy hydrogen actually exists is to properly evaluate the real-world evidence that Applicant and independent third parties have generated. For the Committee to now assert that this real-world evidence "detract[s] from the central issue that the hydrino does not theoretically exist" turns science on its head and is an embarrassment to a government agency charged with "promot[ing] the Progress of Science and useful Arts." [See U.S. Constitution, Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 8.]

### **Summary**

In sum, Applicant is completely mystified by the Secret Committee's arbitrary and often hostile approach that so far has denied him a fair and expeditious examination of his applications in confirmation of the "allowance is not an option" policy divulged by former Examiners of Applicant's cases. There is simply no other way to describe the Committee's reliance on tainted "evidence" (e.g., Dr. Rathke's fraudulent article) and other questionable analyses that lower-energy hydrogen cannot exist under a haphazard framework that lacks proper legal support and instead relies on a patchwork of contrived vague and double standards—and often no standards at all. Even when Applicant meets these so-called "standards," such as those requiring him to publish his scientific evidence in peer-reviewed journals to be considered credible and to show acceptance of his technology by the scientific community, the Committee simply introduces new "standards" as a further excuse to dismiss that evidence. So now,

before any of Applicant's experimental evidence can be fully considered, all of it must successfully complete the peer-review process, but only if it is published in journals that the Committee deems to be sufficiently "mainstream." And even then, the Committee still can and does ignore Applicant's evidence under the extreme view that it supposedly detracts from what the Committee considers to be the central issue in this case, *i.e.*, that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is supposedly theoretically impossible and, therefore, is considered "incredible."

In Applicant's view, it would be far easier to nail jelly to the wall than to meet the Committee's arbitrary and capricious patentability requirements for enablement and utility. Applicant has had over \$50 million of private investment in the research being conducted at BlackLight Power's 53,000-square-foot facility, resulting in the publication of over 65 peer-reviewed articles in esteemed scientific journals citing evidence of lower-energy hydrogen. The Committee's rejection of that considerable body of work based on arguments and "standards" that exalt fraudulent articles and other blatant misrepresentations over real-world evidence is an insult not just to this one applicant, but to the entire patent community which puts its trust in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to fairly administer the laws and regulations governing the examination process.

The Committee's continued hostile approach to examination of Applicant's patent applications led by an Examiner (BMS President Souw) whose views are clearly clouded by competing outside business interests, and its refusal to fairly consider Applicant's experimental evidence published in over 65 peer-reviewed articles, is perhaps best explained in the March 10, 2006 edition of the *Financial Times*:

Psychologists call it **cognitive dissonance: the mental torment that comes from being confronted by two fundamentally opposed propositions**. Deciding between them often provokes powerful emotions – just ask Dr Randell Mills, whose claims have a habit of triggering severe bouts of cognitive dissonance among otherwise perfectly rational people.

\* \* \*

**Faced with making up their minds, many scientists have shown the classic symptom of cognitive dissonance: spluttering rage** (it is a safe bet that some are even now tapping out letters of complaint to this newspaper). **They simply refuse point-blank to believe that Dr Mills**

**could have found a form of atomic energy missed by the likes of Albert Einstein and Ernest Rutherford.**

\* \* \*

Not that Dr Mills cares about what mainstream scientists think about his - theory: he is too busy extracting ever more insights from it – most recently, **formulas describing the properties of molecules, something that has proved beyond the powers of quantum mechanics . . . .** [Emphasis added (Attachment T).]

The views of the Committee, expressed most prominently by Examiner/BMS President Souw, in refusing to fairly consider Applicant's evidence in favor of adopting fraudulent "evidence" is simply outrageous and displays all the signs of cognitive dissonance reported by the *Financial Times*. Applicant therefore repeats his prior demands that the present rejections be withdrawn and that Dr. Souw be replaced immediately so that the experimental evidence of record can finally be given the fair and expeditious hearing Applicant deserves, whereupon his patents can then begin issuing once again.

#### **Demand for Information and Redress**

Applicant believes that the totality of events documented above are highly relevant to the PTO's examination of all of BlackLight's patent applications and accurately describe the detrimental effects that examination has had on Applicant's patent rights. These events further demonstrate the PTO's failure to provide adequate safeguards to the interests of Applicant, including fair and expeditious examination, as contemplated by the Federal Circuit in its June 28, 2002 Decision. Applicant therefore respectfully demands that the PTO provide certain information and redress, including:

- 1) identification of all Examiners or other PTO personnel who were consulted, or otherwise provided input, in the examination of BlackLight's applications;
- 2) identification of all other persons from outside the PTO who were consulted, or otherwise provided input, in the examination of BlackLight's applications;



- 3) identification of all PTO officials responsible for withdrawing BlackLight's five allowed applications from issuance and a complete disclosure of the facts and circumstances surrounding that withdrawal action;
- 4) identification of all outside sources of information who may have precipitated, or otherwise contributed to, the PTO withdrawing BlackLight's five allowed applications from issuance and a complete disclosure of the facts and circumstances surrounding those actions;
- 5) a complete disclosure of the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of Examiner Langel from examining BlackLight's applications and the transfer of those cases to a new Examiner, including, but not limited to, identification of all persons involved in those actions;
- 6) the information sought above in connection with the questionable statements made by Examiner Wayner in the '180 application;
- 7) the information sought above in connection with (a) Dr. Souw's conflict of interest in owning and operating BMS Enterprise while assigned by the PTO to examine BlackLight's pending patent applications; and (b) Dr. Souw's reliance on the fraudulent article written by Dr. Adreas Rathke to reject those applications;
- 8) the immediate removal of Examiner/BMS President Souw, and other members of the Secret Committee, from examining all pending BlackLight applications, and the reinstatement of Examiner Langel to his position as the Examiner of record in those cases to which he had been previously assigned;
- 9) the examination and issuance of all allowable BlackLight applications in accordance with the above-mentioned representations and agreements made at the February 11, 2003 Interview; and
- 10) as a matter of equity, the immediate issuance, without further examination, of all five of BlackLight's withdrawn patent applications due to the PTO's failure to provide the safeguards to the interests of Applicant, including fair and expeditious further examination, as contemplated by the Federal Circuit in its June 28, 2002 Decision.

#### **Response to Arguments Raised in the Advisory Action Mailed 13 December 2006**

Applicant reached agreements with the PTO during the February 11, 2003 Interview as to how it would conduct its examination of BlackLight's applications

following the tumultuous prosecution history of these cases. The Secret Committee, in its subsequent Office Actions, including the present one, has defaulted on those agreements, whereby examination in this case has reverted back to ignoring most of Applicant's scientific evidence on baseless theoretical grounds without applying reasonable patent standards in furtherance of its "allowance is not an option" policy. Despite the unfairness of these actions, Applicant will not be deterred from seeking the patent rights to which he is entitled.

With that said, Applicant now addresses and defeats the Committee's arguments presented in its latest Office Action, which primarily rely upon the biased and erroneous views of its lead Examiner, Dr. Bernard Eng-Kie Souw, including those found in the numerous Appendices he authored.<sup>142</sup> Applicant has rebutted each and every point raised in this Office Action and explains why each lacks merit. As previously discussed, the Committee's adoption of Dr. Souw's views to reject the claims in this case is also misguided due to his genuine conflict of interest in working as the lead scientist for a competing company (BMS Enterprise) while examining Applicant's cases and in citing his own technical papers against Applicant.

For these many reasons, the Committee's biased and erroneous rejections are simply not credible and do not stand up to Applicant's overwhelming experimental evidence of lower-energy hydrogen that the Committee has either misconstrued or dismissed altogether on highly questionable grounds. In doing so, the Committee has once again turned its back on an agreed upon standard, this time involving its self-imposed requirement that Applicant publish his experimental data supporting the existence of lower-energy hydrogen in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Applicant protests these arbitrary actions in the strongest terms possible and requests that the Committee reconsider its tenuous position and immediately allow this case to issue.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> Applicant further includes as part of this Response his rebuttal to Dr. Souw's Consolidated Appendix, which includes many of the same erroneous arguments found in the present Office Action.

<sup>143</sup> To fully comprehend the unfairness of the Committee's dismissal of Applicant's scientific data, it should first be noted that it was the Committee that required Applicant, over his strenuous objections, to publish that data in peer-reviewed scientific journals. This requirement stemmed from an Interview held on February 21, 2001, during which Examiner Vasudevan Jagannathan refused to take seriously the data presented at the Interview because it had not been subjected to the peer-review process required by most scientific journals prior to publication. For instance, as discussed above, Examiner Jagannathan

Despite the fact that the Committee has never cited any authority to support its publication requirement, Applicant expended considerable effort—not to mention millions of research dollars—complying with it. Yet, now that Applicant has published his experimental data in over 65 technical papers appearing in a number of respected scientific journals, with another 50-plus papers soon to follow, Applicant is advised that those efforts were for naught.

The arguments contained in Committee's present Office Action are astonishing for many other reasons, but mostly for the level of hostility directed at Applicant. The Committee cites no legitimate scientific evidence against Applicant to counter the voluminous real-world evidence he submitted in his peer-reviewed journal articles establishing the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. Rather, the Committee relies on the conflicted views of its lead Examiner/BMS President Souw, and on dubious articles, such as the one authored by Dr. Andreas Rathke, who criticizes Applicant's theory as flawed by fraudulently misrepresenting his mathematical equations. The Committee applies this and other fictitious "evidence" in an effort to elevate to a physical law what amounts to an outdated theory of quantum mechanics that is itself fatally flawed to make it seem as though Applicant's claimed technology is "incredible." Even the conflicted Dr. Souw has recognized that quantum theory is flawed, *i.e.*, "needs cimprovement," and that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is not impossible. [See *supra*.]

Turning now to the Committee's specific arguments, the Committee contends on page 2 of the Advisory Action that:

Much of applicant's paper of 08 November 2006 repeats arguments made previously, and relate to matters not germane to the patentability of applicant's invention, such as court cases, interviews held over 5 years ago, and comments by a Dr. Park, whose existence is known to the present examiner only because Dr. Park has previously been mentioned by applicant.

---

mischaracterized Applicant's highly reliable spectroscopic data as nothing more than a "bunch of squiggly lines."

The Committee is disingenuous in its claim that Applicant's arguments listed above are not germane to the patentability of his invention. They most certainly are germane and the Committee's refusal to recognize as much, once again, merely reflects its adversarial approach to prosecuting this and other pending patent applications filed by Applicant. With regard to the court cases, it is first worth noting that the Committee itself introduced those cases into the prosecution of at least four of Applicant's pending patent applications. Certainly then, Applicant cannot be faulted for discussing them here.

The court cases are further relevant to the extent that the PTO has taken positions in those cases that touch on the patentability of Applicant's lower-energy technology for reasons already discussed *ad nauseam*. It is beyond hypocritical for the PTO to have argued that Applicant's previously allowed patent applications were properly withdrawn based on supposed concerns over patentability, and then to argue now that those cases are not germane to patentability. Yet, that has not stopped the Committee from ignoring this important aspect of the prosecution history, along with the Federal Circuit's directive that affirmed the PTO's questionable conduct under the erroneous presumption that Applicant would receive from the PTO a fair and expeditious hearing on his novel hydrogen technology.

As for the Interviews that were "held over 5 years ago," they are no less relevant today than at the time they were initially held. Those Interviews include substantive representations made by the PTO that are an integral part of the prosecution history of this case. Applicant is unaware of a single procedural rule or court case—and the Committee has not cited any such authority—that allows for any part of an application's prosecution history to be expunged or ignored after a certain period of time has elapsed. Given the questionable positions the Committee has taken, and standards it has imposed, in rejecting Applicant's novel hydrogen technology—which points need not be repeated here—it is little wonder that the Committee does not want to be reminded of Interviews that have been held.

As for Dr. Park's sordid history of interfering in the prosecution of Applicant's pending patent applications, that too is an important part of the record that touches on patentability and is relevant for other reasons previously discussed. Simply ignoring

that history will not make it go away. In any case, whether or not the named Examiner was aware of Dr. Park is simply irrelevant. Applicant does find it somewhat surprising, however, the Examiner's claim that he didn't know of Dr. Park's existence given that his comments were cited as a basis for withdrawing Applicant's allowed patent applications, and his name came up during at least one Interview as a reason for maintaining rejections in all of Applicant's pending cases. Based on that history, and his maintenance of "Deep Throat" contacts at the Patent Office, it seems that Dr. Park has achieved "rock star" status at the Patent Office and, thus, would be well known to all those involved in the examination of Applicant's lower-energy hydrogen technology.

On page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Committee erroneously argues that:

Applicant argues that he has shown Krieg's analysis, relied on by the "Committee", to be flawed. Krieg calculates the orbital radius for an electron around a proton (i.e. a hydrogen nucleus) in four steps. First, he states that total energy, identified by the variable "E", is the sum of kinetic and potential energy. Second, he uses the laws of electricity and magnetism to establish the potential energy of the proton-electron system. Third, he used the uncertainty principle to get an order of magnitude estimate for the momentum of an electron for a given orbit, which orbit is identified by its radius as "r". Fourth, he used calculus find the minimum value of "r" by taking the derivative of "E" and setting it equal to zero. Applicant does not address these steps shown by Krieg, but instead discusses electron motion in a cyclotron, which would input inot the electron levels of energy far beyond that experienced in its normal orbital.

These arguments have no scientific basis. For one thing, it is improper to use the uncertainty principle to set the angular momentum as exactly  $\hbar$  as alleged by the Krieg and the Committee. This has been pointed out by other well known theoreticians as cited in the Mills article:

80. R. L. Mills, The Fallacy of Feynman's Argument on the Stability of the Hydrogen Atom According to Quantum Mechanics, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, Vol. 30, No. 2, (2005), pp. 129-151.

For example, Lieb [E. H. Lieb, "The stability of matter", Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 48, No. 4, (1976), pp. 553-569] also addresses the fact that the Schrödinger equation has been accepted for over a half of a century without addressing the stability of matter. Lieb also shows that the Feynman argument is

"false" due to an inappropriate application of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle and admonishes the misrepresentation in textbooks.

The entire argument of using the uncertainty principle to calculate exactly the Bohr formula with the corresponding radius is absolutely flawed. It is not physical, and it is not even internally consistent with standard quantum mechanics.

The many points by which this approach is flawed is detailed in Applicant's published article:

80. R. L. Mills, The Fallacy of Feynman's Argument on the Stability of the Hydrogen Atom According to Quantum Mechanics, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, Vol. 30, No. 2, (2005), pp. 129-151.

The Committee erroneously argues on pages 3-4 of the Advisory Action that:

Applicant argues (page 30) that in the Appendix to the Office action of 24 August 2004, in Serial No. 08/467,051, Dr. Souw stated that "[t]he PTO's view is not at all that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen were [sic] impossible", which would mean that "lower energy states cannot be in violation of any physical law", and that the "Committee" has taken a contrary position, taking the "ground state of an electron of a hydrogen atom" to be a physical law that applicant has violated. This statement concerning the position of the "Committee" would contradict applicant's assertion (page 24), that the "Committee" has failed to identify any laws that have been violated. However, in stating Dr. Souw's position, applicant omits part of Dr. Souw's statement, where he states that "(a) Applicant's invention is not supported by any experimental fact or evidence, and (b) the underlying theory (i.e., GUT/CQM) fails to support the invention, because it contains too many flaws", the theory that Dr. Souw refers alleging the existence of lower-energy hydrogen. Since the theory behind lower-energy hydrogen is flawed (according to Dr. Souw), their existence is not supported, and the physical law concerning the "ground state" of hydrogen atoms remains accepted by the examiner.

Once again the Committee cites a non-existent law, "the physical law concerning the 'ground state,'" in a desperate attempt to discredit Applicant. There is no physical or other law regarding the ground state of hydrogen. The Committee has it entirely backwards. Applicant's invention is based on applying physical laws, such as Newton's laws and Maxwell's equations to the electron. In contrast, under principles of SQM, the Committee's so-called "physical law regarding the ground state" is a contradiction in

terms as it is not based on physical laws, but rather, has been shown to violate them. Applicant finds this latest argument astonishing for additional reasons. For one thing, it is noteworthy that the Committee fails to address Dr. Souw's glaring admission that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen is not impossible. As previously noted, the Committee's assertion that Applicant's novel technology based on lower energy states of hydrogen violates physical law and thus can't possibly work contradicts the express position taken by its lead Examiner, Dr. Souw. When Applicant previously criticized the Committee for its failure to fairly consider Applicant's scientific evidence on the basis that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen was impossible, Dr. Souw took exception to that criticism claiming that "[t]he PTO's view is not at all that the existence of lower-energy hydrogen were [sic] impossible." [See, for instance, Dr. Souw's Appendix at p. 3 attached to the Committee's August 24, 2004 Office Action filed in Applicant's U.S. App'n Ser. No. 08/467,051.] Clearly then, if Dr. Souw does not consider the existence of lower-energy hydrogen impossible, such lower energy states cannot be in violation of any physical law. In now taking a contrary position, the Committee has unwittingly undermined the credibility of Dr. Souw and calls into question other views expressed by him.

The fact that Dr. Souw considers the lower energy states of hydrogen a possibility completely undercuts any notion that the ground state of hydrogen is a physical law. Dr. Souw's further recognition that Quantum Theory is flawed also casts doubt on his arguments equating the Schrodinger Equation and its alleged establishment of the ground state of hydrogen with a physical law that cannot be broken. Finally, Dr. Souw's refusal to properly consider Applicant's experimental evidence, as documented above, cannot be used as a basis for concluding that Applicant's invention is not sufficiently supported by such evidence. The so-called "flaws" argued by the Committee are nonexistent. Applicant has repeatedly rebutted those arguments without adequate response from the Committee, further exposing its erroneous assumption that equates the ground state of hydrogen with physical law.

The Committee's identification of the "ground state of an electron of a hydrogen atom" as a physical law that cannot be broken is akin to those who believed that the

earth was flat and that the sun revolved around the earth before breakthrough scientific evidence proved them wrong. The Committee is now in the embarrassing position of dismissing Applicant's scientific evidence demonstrating that the hydrogen atom can be made stable below the ground state because to accomplish that feat would supposedly violate physical law. Such circular reasoning does not reflect well on a governmental agency charged with promoting the progress of science. If complying with physical laws is indeed the standard the Committee is applying, then surely it must condemn SQM with all of its anomalies that have no basis in reality and embrace Applicant's CQM, which is premised in compliance with physical laws, even at the atomic level.

Furthermore, the Committee's argument regarding the stability of the hydrogen atom according to the HUP as applied by Krieg has no basis in fact, as shown thirty years ago by Lieb in the paper:

E. H. Lieb, "The stability of matter", Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 48, No. 4, (1976), pp, 553-569.

and more recently by Applicant in his paper:

80. R. L. Mills, The Fallacy of Feynman's Argument on the Stability of the Hydrogen Atom According to Quantum Mechanics, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, Vol. 30, No. 2, (2005), pp. 129-151.

Other theoreticians, such as those at Princeton University, agree with Applicant's arguments—given in 80. R. L. Mills, The Fallacy of Feynman's Argument on the Stability of the Hydrogen Atom According to Quantum Mechanics, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, Vol. 30, No. 2, (2005), pp. 129-151—that the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle provides no atomic stability. [See E. H. Lieb, "The stability of matter", Reviews of Modern Physics, Vol. 48, No. 4, (1976), pp, 553-569.]

Lieb [34] also addresses the fact that the Schrödinger equation has been accepted for over a half of a century without addressing the stability of matter. Lieb also shows that the Feynman argument is "false" due to an inappropriate application of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle and admonishes the misrepresentation in textbooks. By considering a wavefunction comprised of two components at two radii such that the electron can not have both sharply defined momentum and position in accordance with



the Uncertainty Principle, Lieb shows that the radius can be arbitrarily small including zero such that the energy is negative infinity. This result is obviously not predictive of stability.

Furthermore, the approach by Feynman and Lieb are physically baseless. Attempts to prove that a system has a kinetic energy that exceeds some lower bound such that the total energy is not negative infinity is not based on physics since it ignores radiation-loss terms. More recently, Bugliaro et al. [35] have attempted to use QED to prove the stability of matter with  $N$  nonrelativistic electrons and  $K$  static nuclei of nuclear charge  $\leq Ze$  that can interact with photons. Here, the problem is "rigged" since the radiation field is defined to be quantized, an ultraviolet cutoff is arbitrarily imposed, Maxwell's equations are not obeyed due to the defined properties of the polarizations, and creation and annihilation operators including the limitation of the couplings of photons to electrons via Pauli operators only. Furthermore, the proof has nothing to do with the solutions of the actual atomic energy levels. Even then, stability is only found for a nuclear charge  $Z \leq 6$ . Thus, it is evident that neither the Schrödinger equation, variants thereof, or QED provide a general, self consistent, rigorous, and physical basis for the stability of matter.

Thus, Applicant has shown that Krieg's analysis on which the Committee relies is fundamentally flawed and provides no basis for its erroneous conclusion that the ground state of  $n=1$  is a physical law that cannot be violated. It comes as no surprise that this faulty analysis cited by the Committee appears in a web page. What is surprising, however, is that the Committee would place so much weight on what amounts to nothing more than internet chatter, yet dismisses out of hand Applicant's real-world scientific evidence appearing in over 60 peer-reviewed articles, based on the false assumption that what was believed to be the ground state of hydrogen is a physical law that cannot be violated. The Committee has mentioned on many previous occasions "the credibility that peer-reviewed articles have." That was, of course, until Applicant began meeting, and far exceeding, the new standard of patentability the Committee imposed on him to publish his scientific evidence. The time has come for the Committee to stop arbitrarily manufacturing excuses for dismissing that evidence and to grant Applicant the fair and expeditious examination to which he is entitled.


Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant will only say that he remains in total disbelief that the PTO would allow Dr. Souw, with such a flagrant conflict of interest, along with the likes of Drs. Rathke, Zimmerman, and Park, to so corrupt the examination of what is probably the most pioneering invention of our time. To date, Applicant has secured over \$50 million in private funding for the research being conducted at BlackLight Power's 53,000-square-foot facility, which research has resulted in the publication of over 65 peer-reviewed articles in esteemed scientific journals. Applicant will not jeopardize that investment by allowing the Committee to treat him like some crazed inventor working out of his garage. Applicant calls for the Committee to stop the nonsense and give him the fair and expeditious hearing to which the Federal Circuit has said he is entitled.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application fully satisfies the legal requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, and is therefore in condition for allowance. A Notice to that affect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Manelli, Denison & Selter, PLLC

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey S. Melcher  
Reg. No.: 35,950  
Tel. No.: 202.261.1045  
Fax. No.: 202.887.0336

Customer No. 20736

## Journal and Book Publications

114. R. Mills, K. Akhtar, B. Dhandapani, "Tests of Features of Field-Acceleration Models for the Extraordinary Selective H Balmer  $\alpha$  Broadening in Certain Hydrogen Mixed Plasmas", Journal of Plasma Physics, submitted.
113. R. Mills, "Physical Solutions of the Nature of the Atom, Photon, and Their Interactions to Form Excited and Predicted Hydrino States", New Journal of Physics, submitted.
112. R. L. Mills, J. He, Y. Lu, M. Nansteel, Z. Chang, B. Dhandapani, "Comprehensive Identification and Potential Applications of New States of Hydrogen", International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, submitted.
111. R. Mills, J. He, Z. Chang, W. Good, Y. Lu, B. Dhandapani, "Catalysis of Atomic Hydrogen to Novel Hydrogen Species  $H^-(1/4)$  and  $H_2(1/4)$  as a New Power Source", Advanced Synthesis and Catalysis, submitted.
110. R. L. Mills, J. He, Z. Chang, W. Good, Y. Lu, B. Dhandapani, "Catalysis of Atomic Hydrogen to Novel Hydrides as a New Power Source," Prepr. Pap.-Am. Chem. Soc., Div. Fuel Chem. 2005, 50(2).
109. R. L. Mills, M. Nansteel, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Low-Voltage EUV and Visible Light Source Due to Catalysis of Atomic Hydrogen", J. Plasma Physics, submitted.
108. R. L. Mills, J. He, M. Nansteel, B. Dhandapani, "Catalysis of Atomic Hydrogen to New Hydrides as a New Power Source", International Journal of Global Energy Issues (IJGEI), Special Edition in Energy Systems, submitted.
107. R. L. Mills, "Maxwell's Equations and QED: Which is Fact and Which is Fiction", Physics Essays, submitted.
106. R. L. Mills, "Exact Classical Quantum Mechanical Solution for Atomic Helium Which Predicts Conjugate Parameters from a Unique Solution for the First Time", Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, submitted.
105. J. Phillips, C-K Chen, R. Mills, "Evidence of catalytic Production of Hot Hydrogen in RF Generated Hydrogen/Argon Plasmas", IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, submitted.
104. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, W. Good, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Fuel Chemistry, Session: Advances in Hydrogen Energy, 228th American Chemical Society National Meeting, August 22-26, 2004, Philadelphia, PA.
103. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, J. He, "New States of Hydrogen Isolated from  $K_2CO_3$  Electrolysis Gases", Chemical Engineering Science, submitted.

102. R. L. Mills, "Exact Classical Quantum Mechanical Solutions for One- Through Twenty-Electron Atoms", Physics Essays, submitted.
101. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Fuel Chemistry, Session: Chemistry of Solid, Liquid, and Gaseous Fuels, 227th American Chemical Society National Meeting, March 28-April 1, 2004, Anaheim, CA.
100. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Highly Stable Amorphous Silicon Hydride from a Helium Plasma Reaction", Materials Chemistry and Physics, submitted.
99. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, B. Dhandapani, "Spectral Identification of  $H_2(1/2)$ ", submitted.
98. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, J. He, M. Nansteel, P. Ray, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Spectral Identification of New States of Hydrogen", New Journal of Chemistry, submitted.
97. R. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, "Evidence of an Energy Transfer Reaction Between Atomic Hydrogen and Argon II or Helium II as the Source of Excessively Hot H Atoms in RF Plasmas", Journal of Plasma Physics, submitted.
96. J. Phillips, C. K. Chen, R. Mills, "Evidence of the Production of Hot Hydrogen Atoms in RF Plasmas by Catalytic Reactions Between Hydrogen and Oxygen Species", Journal of Plasma Physics, submitted.
95. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, "Excessive Balmer  $\alpha$  Line Broadening of Water-Vapor Capacitively-Coupled RF Discharge Plasmas" IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, submitted.
94. R. L. Mills, "The Nature of the Chemical Bond Revisited and an Alternative Maxwellian Approach", Physics Essays, in press.
93. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, J. He, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction Forms a New State of Hydrogen", Doklady Chemistry, submitted.
92. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, J. He, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, Luca Gamberale, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Central European Journal of Physics, submitted.
91. R. Mills, P. Ray, "New H I Laser Medium Based on Novel Energetic Plasma of Atomic Hydrogen and Certain Group I Catalysts", J. Plasma Physics, submitted.
90. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, J. He, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, ""Characterization of an Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Am. Chem. Soc. Div. Fuel Chem. Prepr., Vol. 48, No. 2, (2003).
89. R. Mills, P. C. Ray, M. Nansteel, W. Good, P. Jansson, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Hydrogen Plasmas Generated Using Certain Group I Catalysts Show Stationary Inverted Lyman

- Populations and Free-Free and Bound-Free Emission of Lower-Energy State Hydride", Fizika A, submitted.
88. R. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, "Role of Atomic Hydrogen Density and Energy in Low Power CVD Synthesis of Diamond Films", Thin Solid Films, Vol. 478, (2005), pp. 77-90.
87. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, P. Ray, "Liquid-Nitrogen-Condensable Molecular Hydrogen Gas Isolated from a Catalytic Plasma Reaction", J. Phys. Chem. B, submitted.
86. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. He, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, "Novel Spectral Series from Helium-Hydrogen Evenson Microwave Cavity Plasmas that Matched Fractional-Principal-Quantum-Energy-Level Atomic and Molecular Hydrogen", European Journal of Physics, submitted.
85. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, R. M. Mayo, Highly Pumped Inverted Balmer and Lyman Populations, New Journal of Physics, submitted.
84. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. Dong, M. Nansteel, R. M. Mayo, B. Dhandapani, X. Chen, "Comparison of Balmer  $\alpha$  Line Broadening and Power Balances of Helium-Hydrogen Plasma Sources", Braz. J. Phys., submitted.
83. R. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, R. M. Mayo, "Comparison of Water-Plasma Sources of Stationary Inverted Balmer and Lyman Populations for a CW HI Laser", J. Appl. Spectroscopy, in preparation.
82. R. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, "Synthesis and Characterization of Diamond Films from MPCVD of an Energetic Argon-Hydrogen Plasma and Methane", J. of Materials Research, submitted.
81. R. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, P. Jansson, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Spectroscopic and NMR Identification of Novel Hydride Ions in Fractional Quantum Energy States Formed by an Exothermic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen with Certain Catalysts", European Physical Journal-Applied Physics, Vol. 28, (2004), pp. 83-104.
80. R. L. Mills, The Fallacy of Feynman's Argument on the Stability of the Hydrogen Atom According to Quantum Mechanics, Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie, submitted.
79. R. Mills, J. He, B. Dhandapani, P. Ray, "Comparison of Catalysts and Microwave Plasma Sources of Vibrational Spectral Emission of Fractional-Rydberg-State Hydrogen Molecular Ion", Canadian Journal of Physics, submitted.
78. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, X. Chen, B. Dhandapani, "Vibrational Spectral Emission of Fractional-Principal-Quantum-Energy-Level Molecular Hydrogen", J. of the Physical Society of Japan, submitted.

77. J. Phillips, R. L. Mills, X. Chen, "Water Bath Calorimetric Study of Excess Heat in 'Resonance Transfer' Plasmas", *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 96, No. 6, pp. 3095-3102.
76. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, X. Chen, "Comparison of Catalysts and Microwave Plasma Sources of Spectral Emission of Fractional-Principal-Quantum-Energy-Level Atomic and Molecular Hydrogen", *Journal of Applied Spectroscopy*, submitted.
75. R. L. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, P. Ray, "Novel Liquid-Nitrogen-Condensable Molecular Hydrogen Gas", *Acta Physica Polonica A*, submitted.
74. R. L. Mills, P. C. Ray, R. M. Mayo, M. Nansteel, B. Dhandapani, J. Phillips, "Spectroscopic Study of Unique Line Broadening and Inversion in Low Pressure Microwave Generated Water Plasmas", *J. Plasma Physics*, Vol. 71 (2005) pp. 877-88.
73. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Energetic Helium-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction", *AIAA Journal*, submitted.
72. R. L. Mills, M. Nansteel, P. C. Ray, "Bright Hydrogen-Light and Power Source due to a Resonant Energy Transfer with Strontium and Argon Ions", *Vacuum*, submitted.
71. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. Dong, X. Chen, "Power Source Based on Helium-Plasma Catalysis of Atomic Hydrogen to Fractional Rydberg States", *Contributions to Plasma Physics*, submitted.
70. R. Mills, J. He, A. Echezuria, B Dhandapani, P. Ray, "Comparison of Catalysts and Plasma Sources of Vibrational Spectral Emission of Fractional-Rydberg-State Hydrogen Molecular Ion", *European Journal of Physics D*, submitted.
69. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Spectroscopic Characterization of the Atomic Hydrogen Energies and Densities and Carbon Species During Helium-Hydrogen-Methane Plasma CVD Synthesis of Diamond Films", *Chemistry of Materials*, Vol. 15, (2003), pp. 1313-1321.
68. R. Mills, P. Ray, R. M. Mayo, "Stationary Inverted Balmer and Lyman Populations for a CW HI Water-Plasma Laser", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, submitted.
67. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Extreme Ultraviolet Spectroscopy of Helium-Hydrogen Plasma", *J. Phys. D, Applied Physics*, Vol. 36, (2003), pp. 1535-1542.
66. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Evidence for a Water-Plasma Laser", *Europhysics Letters*, submitted.
65. R. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Evidence for Highly Pumped Balmer and Lyman Populations in a Water-Plasma", *J. of Applied Physics*, submitted.
64. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Low Power MPCVD of Diamond Films on Silicon Substrates", *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A*, submitted.

63. R. L. Mills, X. Chen, P. Ray, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Plasma Power Source Based on a Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen Measured by Water Bath Calorimetry", *Thermochimica Acta*, Vol. 406/1-2, (2003), pp. 35-53.
62. R. L. Mills, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Synthesis and Spectroscopic Identification of Lithium Chloro Hydride", *Materials Characterization*, submitted.
61. R. L. Mills, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Highly Stable Amorphous Silicon Hydride", *Solar Energy Materials & Solar Cells*, Vol. 80, No. 1, (2003), pp. 1-20.
60. R. L. Mills, J. Sankar, P. Ray, A. Voigt, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Synthesis of HDLC Films from Solid Carbon", *Journal of Material Science*, Vol. 39, (2004), pp. 3309-3318.
59. R. Mills, P. Ray, R. M. Mayo, "The Potential for a Hydrogen Water-Plasma Laser", *Applied Physics Letters*, Vol. 82, No. 11, (2003), pp. 1679-1681.
58. R. L. Mills, "Classical Quantum Mechanics", *Physics Essays*, Vol. 16, No. 4, December, (2003), pp. 433-498.
57. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Characterization of Stationary Inverted Lyman Populations and Free-Free and Bound-Free Emission of Lower-Energy State Hydride Ion Formed by a Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen and Certain Group I Catalysts", *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, No. 39, sciencedirect.com, April 17, (2003).
56. R. M. Mayo, R. Mills, "Direct Plasmadynamic Conversion of Plasma Thermal Power to Electricity for Microdistributed Power Applications", 40th Annual Power Sources Conference, Cherry Hill, NJ, June 10-13, (2002), pp. 1-4.
55. R. Mills, P. Ray, R. M. Mayo, "Chemically-Generated Stationary Inverted Lyman Population for a CW HI Laser", *European J of Phys. D*, submitted.
54. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Stationary Inverted Lyman Population Formed from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", *J. Phys. D, Applied Physics*, Vol. 36, (2003), pp. 1504-1509.
53. R. Mills, "A Maxwellian Approach to Quantum Mechanics Explains the Nature of Free Electrons in Superfluid Helium", *Braz. J. Phys.*, submitted.
52. R. Mills and M. Nansteel, P. Ray, "Bright Hydrogen-Light Source due to a Resonant Energy Transfer with Strontium and Argon Ions", *New Journal of Physics*, Vol. 4, (2002), pp. 70.1-70.28.
51. R. Mills, P. Ray, R. M. Mayo, "CW HI Laser Based on a Stationary Inverted Lyman Population Formed from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Group I Catalysts", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, Vol. 31, No. 2, (2003), pp. 236-247.

50. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, J. Dong, M. Nansteel, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Spectral Emission of Fractional-Principal-Quantum-Energy-Level Atomic and Molecular Hydrogen", *Vibrational Spectroscopy*, Vol. 31, No. 2, (2003), pp. 195-213.
49. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Comparison of Excessive Balmer  $\alpha$  Line Broadening of Inductively and Capacitively Coupled RF, Microwave, and Glow Discharge Hydrogen Plasmas with Certain Catalysts", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, Vol. 31, No. (2003), pp. 338-355.
48. R. M. Mayo, R. Mills, M. Nansteel, "Direct Plasmadynamic Conversion of Plasma Thermal Power to Electricity", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, October, (2002), Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 2066-2073.
47. H. Conrads, R. Mills, Th. Wrubel, "Emission in the Deep Vacuum Ultraviolet from a Plasma Formed by Incandescently Heating Hydrogen Gas with Trace Amounts of Potassium Carbonate", *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, Vol. 12, (2003), pp. 389-395.
46. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Stationary Inverted Lyman Population and a Very Stable Novel Hydride Formed by a Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen and Certain Catalysts", *Optical Materials*, Vol. 27, (2004), pp. 181-186.
45. R. L. Mills, J. He, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, X. Chen, "Synthesis and Characterization of a Highly Stable Amorphous Silicon Hydride as the Product of a Catalytic Helium-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 28, No. 12, (2003), pp. 1401-1424.
44. R. L. Mills, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Synthesis and Characterization of Lithium Chloro Hydride", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, submitted.
43. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Substantial Changes in the Characteristics of a Microwave Plasma Due to Combining Argon and Hydrogen", *New Journal of Physics*, [www.njp.org](http://www.njp.org), Vol. 4, (2002), pp. 22.1-22.17.
42. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "A Comprehensive Study of Spectra of the Bound-Free Hyperfine Levels of Novel Hydride Ion  $H^-(1/2)$ , Hydrogen, Nitrogen, and Air", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 28, No. 8, (2003), pp. 825-871.
41. R. L. Mills, E. Dayalan, "Novel Alkali and Alkaline Earth Hydrides for High Voltage and High Energy Density Batteries", *Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Battery Conference on Applications and Advances*, California State University, Long Beach, CA, (January 15-18, 2002), pp. 1-6.
40. R. M. Mayo, R. Mills, M. Nansteel, "On the Potential of Direct and MHD Conversion of Power from a Novel Plasma Source to Electricity for Microdistributed Power Applications", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, August, (2002), Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 1568-1578.



39. R. Mills, P. C. Ray, R. M. Mayo, M. Nansteel, W. Good, P. Jansson, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Stationary Inverted Lyman Populations and Free-Free and Bound-Free Emission of Lower-Energy State Hydride Ion Formed by an Exothermic Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen and Certain Group I Catalysts", J. Phys. Chem. A, submitted.
38. R. Mills, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Highly Stable Novel Inorganic Hydrides from Aqueous Electrolysis and Plasma Electrolysis", *Electrochimica Acta*, Vol. 47, No. 24, (2002), pp. 3909-3926.
37. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, R. M. Mayo, J. He, "Comparison of Excessive Balmer  $\alpha$  Line Broadening of Glow Discharge and Microwave Hydrogen Plasmas with Certain Catalysts", J. of Applied Physics, Vol. 92, No. 12, (2002), pp. 7008-7022.
36. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, J. He, "Emission Spectroscopic Identification of Fractional Rydberg States of Atomic Hydrogen Formed by a Catalytic Helium-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction", *Vacuum*, submitted.
35. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, X. Chen, J. He, "New Power Source from Fractional Rydberg States of Atomic Hydrogen", *Current Applied Physics*, submitted.
34. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, X. Chen, J. He, "Spectroscopic Identification of Transitions of Fractional Rydberg States of Atomic Hydrogen", J. of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer, in press.
33. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, X. Chen, J. He, "New Power Source from Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Atomic Hydrogen that Surpasses Internal Combustion", J Mol. Struct., Vol. 643, No. 1-3, (2002), pp. 43-54.
32. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Identification of a Novel Catalytic Reaction of Rubidium Ion with Atomic Hydrogen and the Hydride Ion Product", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 9, (2002), pp. 927-935.
31. R. Mills, J. Dong, W. Good, P. Ray, J. He, B. Dhandapani, "Measurement of Energy Balances of Noble Gas-Hydrogen Discharge Plasmas Using Calvet Calorimetry", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 9, (2002), pp. 967-978.
30. R. L. Mills, A. Voigt, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, B. Dhandapani, "Measurement of Hydrogen Balmer Line Broadening and Thermal Power Balances of Noble Gas-Hydrogen Discharge Plasmas", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 6, (2002), pp. 671-685.
29. R. Mills, P. Ray, "Vibrational Spectral Emission of Fractional-Principal-Quantum-Energy-Level Hydrogen Molecular Ion", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 5, (2002), pp. 533-564.

28. R. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectral Emission of Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Atomic Hydrogen from a Helium-Hydrogen Plasma and the Implications for Dark Matter", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, (2002), Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 301-322.
27. R. Mills, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Identification of a Novel Catalytic Reaction of Potassium and Atomic Hydrogen and the Hydride Ion Product", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 2, (2002), pp. 183-192.
26. R. Mills, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Hydrogen Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", *Proceedings of the National Hydrogen Association, 12 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting and Exposition, Hydrogen: The Common Thread*, The Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington DC, (March 6-8, 2001), pp. 671-697.
25. R. Mills, W. Good, A. Voigt, Jinqun Dong, "Minimum Heat of Formation of Potassium Iodo Hydride", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 11, (2001), pp. 1199-1208.
24. R. Mills, "Spectroscopic Identification of a Novel Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen and the Hydride Ion Product", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 10, (2001), pp. 1041-1058.
23. R. Mills, N. Greenig, S. Hicks, "Optically Measured Power Balances of Glow Discharges of Mixtures of Argon, Hydrogen, and Potassium, Rubidium, Cesium, or Strontium Vapor", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 6, (2002), pp. 651-670.
22. R. Mills, "The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics", Global Foundation, Inc. *Orbis Scientiae* entitled *The Role of Attractive and Repulsive Gravitational Forces in Cosmic Acceleration of Particles The Origin of the Cosmic Gamma Ray Bursts*, (29th Conference on High Energy Physics and Cosmology Since 1964) Dr. Behram N. Kursunoglu, Chairman, December 14-17, 2000, Lago Mar Resort, Fort Lauderdale, FL, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, pp. 243-258.
21. R. Mills, "The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 27, No. 5, (2002), pp. 565-590.
20. R. Mills and M. Nansteel, P. Ray, "Argon-Hydrogen-Strontium Discharge Light Source", *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, Vol. 30, No. 2, (2002), pp. 639-653.
19. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Identification of Compounds Containing Novel Hydride Ions by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 9, (2001), pp. 965-979.
18. R. Mills, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", *Global Foundation International Conference on "Global Warming and Energy Policy"*, Dr. Behram N. Kursunoglu, Chairman, Fort

Lauderdale, FL, November 26-28, 2000, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, pp. 187-202.

17. R. Mills, "The Nature of Free Electrons in Superfluid Helium--a Test of Quantum Mechanics and a Basis to Review its Foundations and Make a Comparison to Classical Theory", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 10, (2001), pp. 1059-1096.
16. R. Mills, M. Nansteel, and P. Ray, "Excessively Bright Hydrogen-Strontium Plasma Light Source Due to Energy Resonance of Strontium with Hydrogen", *J. of Plasma Physics*, Vol. 69, (2003), pp. 131-158.
15. R. Mills, J. Dong, Y. Lu, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Hydrogen Emission from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 25, (2000), pp. 919-943.
14. R. Mills, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Emission from Hydrogen-KI Plasmas Produced by a Hollow Cathode Discharge", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 6, (2001), pp. 579-592.
13. R. Mills, "Temporal Behavior of Light-Emission in the Visible Spectral Range from a Ti-K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>-H-Cell", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (2001), pp. 327-332.
12. R. Mills, T. Onuma, and Y. Lu, "Formation of a Hydrogen Plasma from an Incandescently Heated Hydrogen-Catalyst Gas Mixture with an Anomalous Afterglow Duration", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 7, July, (2001), pp. 749-762.
11. R. Mills, M. Nansteel, and Y. Lu, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Hydrogen Emission from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Strontium that Produced an Anomalous Optically Measured Power Balance", *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (2001), pp. 309-326.
10. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, "Synthesis and Characterization of Potassium Iodo Hydride", *Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 25, Issue 12, December, (2000), pp. 1185-1203.
9. R. Mills, "Novel Inorganic Hydride", *Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 25, (2000), pp. 669-683.
8. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, T. Shannon, A. Echezuria, "Synthesis and Characterization of Novel Hydride Compounds", *Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (2001), pp. 339-367.
7. R. Mills, "Highly Stable Novel Inorganic Hydrides", *Journal of New Materials for Electrochemical Systems*, Vol. 6, (2003), pp. 45-54.
6. R. Mills, "Novel Hydrogen Compounds from a Potassium Carbonate Electrolytic Cell", *Fusion Technology*, Vol. 37, No. 2, March, (2000), pp. 157-182.

5. R. Mills, "The Hydrogen Atom Revisited", Int. J. of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 25, Issue 12, December, (2000), pp. 1171-1183.
4. R. Mills, W. Good, "Fractional Quantum Energy Levels of Hydrogen", Fusion Technology, Vol. 28, No. 4, November, (1995), pp. 1697-1719.
3. R. Mills, W. Good, R. Shaubach, "Dihydrino Molecule Identification", Fusion Technology, Vol. 25, (1994), pp. 103-119.
2. R. Mills, S. Kneizys, Fusion Technol. Vol. 20, (1991), pp. 65-81.
1. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, September 2001 Edition, BlackLight Power, Inc., Cranbury, New Jersey, Distributed by Amazon.com; January 2004 Edition posted at [www.blacklightpower.com](http://www.blacklightpower.com).

### **Book Publications**

8. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, January 2003 Edition, BlackLight Power, Inc., Cranbury, New Jersey, posted at [www.blacklightpower.com](http://www.blacklightpower.com).
7. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, September 2001 Edition, BlackLight Power, Inc., Cranbury, New Jersey, Distributed by Amazon.com.
6. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, January 2000 Edition, BlackLight Power, Inc., Cranbury, New Jersey
5. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, January 1999 Edition.
4. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, September 1996 Edition.
3. R. Mills, *The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics*, (1995), Technomic Publishing Company, Lancaster, PA provided by HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Great Valley Corporate Center, 41 Great Valley Parkway, Malvern, PA 19355
2. R. Mills, *The Unification of Spacetime, the Forces, Matter, and Energy*, Technomic Publishing Company, Lancaster, PA, (1992).
1. R. Mills, J. Farrell, *The Grand Unified Theory*, Science Press, Ephrata, PA, (1990).

### **Correspondence**

5. R. Mills, "One Dimension Gravity Well—A Flawed Interpretation", response to V. V. Nesvizhevsky , Scientific American, submitted.

4. R. Mills, Response to W. Seifritz, Int J of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 28, No. 3, (2003), pp. 359-360.
3. R. Mills, Response to T. Ohta, Int J of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 11, (2001), pp. 1225.
2. R. Mills, Response to I Shechtman, Int J of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 11, (2001), pp. 1229-1231.
1. R. Mills, Response to A. K. Vijh, Int J of Hydrogen Energy, Vol. 26, No. 11, (2001), pp. 1233.

## **Test Reports**

Numerous test reports are available from BlackLight Power (e.g. Haldeman, C. W., Savoye, G. W., Iseler, G. W., Clark, H. R., MIT Lincoln Laboratories Excess Energy Cell Final report ACC Project 174 (3), April 25, 1995; Peterson, S., H., Evaluation of Heat Production from Light Water Electrolysis Cells of HydroCatalysis Power Corporation, Report from Westinghouse STC, 1310 Beulah Road, Pittsburgh, PA, February 25, 1994; Craw-Ivanco, M. T.; Tremblay, R. P.; Boniface, H. A.; Hilborn, J. W.; "Calorimetry for a Ni/K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> Cell", Atomic Energy Canada Limited, Chemical Engineering Branch, Chalk River Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, June 1994; Nesterov, S. B., Kryukov, A. P., Moscow Power Engineering Institute Affidavit, February, 26, 1993; Jacox, M. G., Watts, G. R., "The Search for Excess Heat in the Mills Electrolytic Cell", Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83415, January 7, 1993; Gernert, N., Shaubach, R. M., Mills, R., Good, W., "Nascent Hydrogen: An Energy Source," Final Report prepared by Thermacore, Inc., for the Aero Propulsion and Power Directorate, Wright Laboratory, Air Force Material Command (ASC), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Contract Number F33615-93-C-2326, May, (1994); Phillips, J., Smith, J., Kurtz, S., "Report On Calorimetric Investigations Of Gas-Phase Catalyzed Hydrino Formation" Final report for Period October-December 1996", January 1, 1997, A Confidential Report submitted to BlackLight Power, Inc. provided by BlackLight Power, Inc., Great Valley Corporate Center, 41 Great Valley Parkway, Malvern, PA 19355; B. N. Popov, "Electrochemical Characterization of BlackLight Power, Inc. MH as Electrodes for Li-ion Batteries, Dept. of Chemical Engineering, University of South Carolina, February 6, 2000; Scores of Independent Tests of BlackLight Power's Novel Hydride Compounds from over 20 Independent Testing Laboratories.)

## **Upcoming Conference Presentations**

## **Prior Conference Presentations**

56. R. Mills, "The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics Workshop", at the University of Milano di Politecnico, Milan, Italy, Sponsored by the POLITECNICO Foundation, March 3, 2005.
55. R. Mills, "The Hydrino: Lower-level States of the Hydrogen Atom which Have Remarkable Consequences". Invited Evening Lecture at the 17th Symposium of Plasma Physics and Radiation Technology, sponsored by the Netherlands' Physical Society Section Plasma and Gas Discharge Physics and Research School Center for Plasma Physics and Radiation Technology, Lunteren, Netherlands, March 1-2, 2005.
54. R. Mills, "The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics Workshop", at the University of Eindhoven, Netherlands, February 28, 2005.
53. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, W. Good, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Fuel Chemistry, Session: Advances in Hydrogen Energy, 228th American Chemical Society National Meeting, August 22-26, 2004, Philadelphia, PA.
52. R. L. Mills, BlackLight Power A New Energy Source, Volta Institute, June 25, 2004, Como, Italy.
51. R. L. Mills, Y. Lu, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Fuel Chemistry, Session: Chemistry of Solid, Liquid, and Gaseous Fuels, 227th American Chemical Society National Meeting, March 28-April 1, 2004, Anaheim, CA.
50. R. L. Mills, P. Ray, M. Nansteel, J. He, X. Chen, A. Voigt, B. Dhandapani, "Energetic Catalyst-Hydrogen Plasma Reaction as a Potential New Energy Source," (Division of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Symposium), September 9, 2003, 226<sup>th</sup> American Chemical Society National Meeting, (Sept. 7-11, 2003), New York, NY.
49. B. Dhandapani, R. Mills, "Novel Liquid-Nitrogen-Condensable Molecular Hydrogen Gas" (Physical Chemistry Session) , Wednesday, June 11, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8-11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
48. P. Ray, R. Mills, "Extreme Ultraviolet Spectroscopy of Helium-Hydrogen Plasma" (Physical Chemistry Session) , Wednesday, June 11, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional

Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8–11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

47. R. Mills, "Novel Catalytic Reaction Of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source" (Catalysis Session), Tuesday, June 10, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8–11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
46. J. He, R. Mills, "TOF-SIMS and XPS Studies of Highly Stable Silicon Hydride Films" (Inorganic/Solid State Session), Monday, June 9, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8–11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
45. B. Dhandapani, R. Mills, "Low Power MPCVD Synthesis and Characterization of Diamond Films on Silicon Substrates" (Inorganic/Solid State Session) , Monday, June 9, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8–11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
44. X. Chen, R. Mills, "Calorimetric Study of Heat Generation by Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen in Resonant Transfer Plasmas" (Fuel Cells Session) , Monday, June 9, 2003, 36<sup>th</sup> Middle Atlantic Regional Meeting of American Chemical Society, (June 8–11, 2003), Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
43. R. L. Mills, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, "Green Chemistry in the Design of Alternative Energy Strategies", symposium, Oral Presentation, 225<sup>th</sup> ACS National Meeting, (March 23-27, 2003), New Orleans, LA.
42. R. L. Mills, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Monday, November 25, Room 216, Protocol Center, TA-3, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
41. R. L. Mills, "Classical Quantum Mechanics", Monday, November 25, Room 216, Protocol Center, TA-3, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
40. R. L. Mills, Seminar: "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", US Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Sustainable Technologies Division, Cincinnati, OH, October 24, 2002.
39. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, A. Voigt, M. Nansteel, J. Sankar, R. M. Mayo, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Inorganic Chemistry, Oral Presentation, 224<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (August 18-22, 2002), Boston, MA (Aug. 22, 4:10-4:30 PM).

38. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, A. Voigt, M. Nansteel, J. Sankar, R. M. Mayo, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Colloidal and Surface Chemistry, Oral Presentation, 224<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (August 18-22, 2002), Boston, MA (Aug. 22, 8:30-8:50 AM).
37. P. Ray, R. Mills, "Spectroscopic Characterization of Stationary Inverted Balmer and Lyman Populations Formed by a Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen with Oxygen and with Certain Group I Catalysts", Eighteenth International Conference on Atomic Physics, July 28-August 2, 2002, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
36. R. M. Mayo, R. L. Mills, M. Nansteel, "Direct Plasmadynamic Conversion of Plasma Thermal Power from a Novel Plasma Source to Electricity for Microdistributed Power Applications", 40<sup>th</sup> Power Sources Conference, (June 6-13, 2002), Cherry Hill, NJ.
35. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Spectroscopic Identification of a Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen", Division of Inorganic Chemistry, Oral Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7-11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
34. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Inorganic Chemistry, Oral Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7-11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
33. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, Oral Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7-11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
32. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Catalysis and Surface Science Secretariat, Oral Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7-11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
31. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy Source", Division of Physical Chemistry, Poster Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7-11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
30. R. L. Mills, J. Dong, J. He, B. Dhandapani, W. Good, A. Voigt, S. Hicks, M. Nansteel, E. Dayalan, P. Ray, "Novel Catalytic Reaction of Hydrogen as a Potential New Energy



- Source", Division of Physical Chemistry, Sci-Mix Poster Presentation, 223<sup>rd</sup> ACS National Meeting, (April 7–11, 2002), Orlando, FL.
29. R. Mills, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", *The 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Emerald Groundhog Day Investment Forum*, February 5, 2002, Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel, Philadelphia, PA, Organized by Emerald Asset Management, Lancaster, PA.
28. R. L. Mills, E. Dayalan, "Novel Alkali and Alkaline Earth Hydrides for High Voltage and High Energy Density Batteries", Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Battery Conference on Applications and Advances, California State University, Long Beach, CA, (January 15-18, 2002), pp. 1-6.
27. P. Ray, R. Mills, "Spectroscopic identification of a novel catalytic reaction of hydrogen plasma", Session ET1: Lighting, American Physical Society Meeting, 54<sup>th</sup> Annual Gaseous Electronics Conference, October 9–12, 2001, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA.
26. R. Mills, "Novel catalytic reaction of hydrogen as a potential new energy source", Division of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry; Session: Industrial Bio-Based Technology, 222<sup>nd</sup> American Chemical Society Fall National Meeting, (August 26–30, 2001), Chicago, IL.
25. R. Mills, "Spectroscopic identification of a novel catalytic reaction of hydrogen", Division of Inorganic Chemistry; Session: Catalysis, 222<sup>nd</sup> American Chemical Society Fall National Meeting, (August 26–30, 2001), Chicago, IL.
24. R. Mills, "Spectroscopic identification of a novel catalytic reaction of hydrogen", Division of Physical Chemistry; Session: Physical Chemistry Poster Session, 222<sup>nd</sup> American Chemical Society Fall National Meeting, (August 26–30, 2001), Chicago, IL.
23. R. Mills, J. He, "Spectroscopic Identification of a Novel Catalytic Reaction of Atomic Hydrogen and the Hydride Ion Product", National Hydrogen Association, 12<sup>th</sup> Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting and Exposition, *Hydrogen: The Common Thread*, The Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington DC, (March 6-8, 2001).
22. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, N. Greenig, S. Hicks, J. Dong, "Optically Measured Power Balances of Anomalous Discharges of Mixtures of Argon, Hydrogen, and Potassium, Rubidium, Cesium, or Strontium Vapor", National Hydrogen Association, 12<sup>th</sup> Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting and Exposition, *Hydrogen: The Common Thread*, The Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington DC, (March 6-8, 2001).
21. R. Mills, M. Nansteel, N. Greenig, S. Hicks, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", National Hydrogen

- Association, 12 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting and Exposition, *Hydrogen: The Common Thread*, The Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington DC, (March 6-8, 2001).
20. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, M. Nansteel, J. He, A. Voigt, "Identification of Compounds Containing Novel Hydride Ions by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy", National Hydrogen Association, 12 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting and Exposition, *Hydrogen: The Common Thread*, The Washington Hilton and Towers, Washington DC, (March 6-8, 2001).
19. R. Mills, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", *The 8 th Annual Emerald Groundhog Day Investment Forum*, February 1, 2001, Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel, Philadelphia, PA, Organized by Emerald Asset Management, Lancaster, PA.
18. R. Mills, "The Grand Unified Theory of Classical Quantum Mechanics", Global Foundation, Inc. Orbis Scientiae entitled *The Role of Attractive and Repulsive Gravitational Forces in Cosmic Acceleration of Particles The Origin of the Cosmic Gamma Ray Bursts*, (29th Conference on High Energy Physics and Cosmology Since 1964) Dr. Behram N. Kursunoglu, Chairman, December 14-17, 2000, Lago Mar Resort, Fort Lauderdale, FL.
17. R. Mills, "BlackLight Power Technology-A New Clean Energy Source with the Potential for Direct Conversion to Electricity", Global Foundation, Inc. conference entitled *Global Warming and Energy Policy*, Fort Lauderdale, FL, November 26-28, 2000.
16. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, J. Dong, Y. Lu, and H. Conrads, "Formation of an Energetic Plasma and Novel Hydrides from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", August National ACS Meeting (220th ACS National Meeting, Washington, DC, (August 20-24, 2000)).
15. R. Mills, J. He, and B. Dhandapani, "Novel Alkali and Alkaline Earth Hydrides", August National ACS Meeting (220th ACS National Meeting, Washington, DC, (August 20-24, 2000)).
14. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, J. Dong, Y. Lu, and H. Conrads, "Formation of an Energetic Plasma and Novel Hydrides from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", June ACS Meeting (29th Northeast Regional Meeting, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, (June 18-21, 2000)).
13. Mills, J. Dong, N. Greenig, and Y. Lu, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Hydrogen Emission from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", 219 th National ACS Meeting, San Francisco, California, (March 26-30, 2000).

12. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, J. Dong, Y. Lu, and H. Conrads, "Formation of an Energetic Plasma and Novel Hydrides from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", 219 th National ACS Meeting, San Francisco, California, (March 26-30, 2000).
11. R. Mills, "Novel Hydride Compound", 219 th National ACS Meeting, San Francisco, California, (March 26-30, 2000).
10. R. Mills, J. He, and B. Dhandapani, "Novel Alkali and Alkaline Earth Hydrides", 219 th National ACS Meeting, San Francisco, California, (March 26-30, 2000).
9. R. Mills, J. Dong, N. Greenig, and Y. Lu, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Hydrogen Emission from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", National Hydrogen Association, 11 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting, Vienna, VA, (February 29-March 2, 2000).
8. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, J. Dong, Y. Lu, and H. Conrads, "Formation of an Energetic Plasma and Novel Hydrides from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", National Hydrogen Association, 11 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting, Vienna, VA, (February 29-March 2, 2000).
7. R. Mills, "Novel Hydride Compound", National Hydrogen Association, 11 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting, Vienna, VA, (February 29-March 2, 2000).
6. R. Mills, J. He, and B. Dhandapani, "Novel Alkali and Alkaline Earth Hydrides", National Hydrogen Association, 11 th Annual U.S. Hydrogen Meeting, Vienna, VA, (February 29-March 2, 2000).
5. R. Mills, J. Dong, Y. Lu, J. Conrads, "Observation of Extreme Ultraviolet Hydrogen Emission from Incandescently Heated Hydrogen Gas with Certain Catalysts", 1999 Pacific Conference on Chemistry and Spectroscopy and the 35th ACS Western Regional Meeting, Ontario Convention Center, California, (October 6-8, 1999).
4. R. Mills, "Novel Hydride Compound", 1999 Pacific Conference on Chemistry and Spectroscopy and the 35th ACS Western Regional Meeting, Ontario Convention Center, California, (October 6-8, 1999).
3. R. Mills, B. Dhandapani, N. Greenig, J. He, "Synthesis and Characterization of Potassium Iodo Hydride", 1999 Pacific Conference on Chemistry and Spectroscopy and the 35th ACS Western Regional Meeting, Ontario Convention Center, California, (October 6-8, 1999).
2. R. Mills, J. He, and B. Dhandapani, "Novel Hydrogen Compounds", 1999 Pacific Conference on Chemistry and Spectroscopy and the 35th ACS Western Regional Meeting, Ontario Convention Center, California, (October 6-8, 1999).

1. R. Mills, "Excess Heat Production by the Electrolysis of an Aqueous Potassium Carbonate Electrolyte", August 1991 meeting of the American Chemical Society, NY, NY.